FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-92-001
Thursday
2 January 1992

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-92-001 CONTENTS *2 January 1992*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

NOTICE TO READERS: The United States Government recognizes the independence of the republics of the former Soviet Union.

NOTICE TO READERS: The name of this book will change from the "Soviet Union DAILY REPORT" to the "Central Eurasia DAILY REPORT" with the 6 January 1992 edition. The "Central Eurasia DAILY REPORT" will cover the same geographic area as the "Soviet Union DAILY REPORT." There will also be a reorganization of the sections. The "International Affairs" and the "Interregional Affairs" sections will be reduced, while the individual republic sections will be expanded. Much information previously found in the "International Affairs" and "Interregional Affairs" sections will be found under "Russia: International Affairs" or "Russia: Federation Affairs."

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Arms Control & Disarmament

IZVESTIYA Views U.S. Disarmament Aid *[24 Dec]* 1

United States & Canada

U.S. Response to Alma-Ata Meeting Cited *[IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]* 1
State Department Said To Seek New Missions *[TASS]* 2
U.S. President's Tour Linked to Economy *[IZVESTIYA 28 Dec]* 2

China

PRC Official on 'Recognitions Package' *[IZVESTIYA 31 Dec]* 3
Beijing Official Comments on Talks, Ties *[Moscow Radio]* 4

Northeast Asia

Interview on KAL Disaster Reported *[IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]* 4

Near East & South Asia

Commentary on Halting Arms for Afghanistan *[Moscow International]* 7

East Europe

CSFR's Havel Pays Tribute to Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 30 Dec]* 8

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev Reveals Plans Following Telecast 9
    'Staying in Politics' *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 27 Dec]* 9
    Appeals for Aid *[TASS]* 12
    To Head 'Gorbachev Foundation' *[IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]* 13
Shevardnadze Not 'Trying To Scare People' *[KURANTY 18 Dec]* 13
Yakovlev Debates Democratic Reform Impact *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 25 Dec]* 14
Democratic Reform Movement Congress Viewed *[KULTURA 21 Dec]* 18
Army, CPSU, KGB Coup Involvement Noted *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 31 Dec]* 19
Soyuz Deputy Calls Recent Events 'Coup' *[TASS]* 19

'Only 20 or So' Protest Commonwealth, Leaders *[Moscow Radio]* 19
Bakatin Criticized for Cooperating With U.S. *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY Dec]* 20
Strategic Balance Viewed With Demise of Union *[Moscow International]* 20
TASS Carries PRAVDA Review for 30 Dec 21
    Press Review for 31 Dec *[TASS]* 21
    Press Review for 1 Jan *[TASS]* 22

Commonwealth Affairs

Minsk News Conference Held 30 December *[Moscow TV]* 23
    Shushkevich Summary *[TASS]* 25
Stankevich Sees Future Role for Gorbachev *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Dec]* 26
Member States Agree on Accords, Protocols 26
    Scientific, Industrial Cooperation *[TASS]* 26
    Foreign Ministers To Confer *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Jan]* 26
    Fish Stock Protection *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Jan]* 26
'Precise Agreement on All Questions' Reported *[PRAVDA 1 Jan]* 27
Alma-Ata Nuclear Arms Agreements Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]* 27

Scientific

Subterranean Nuclear Power Stations Planned 28
    Research Director Interviewed *[INTERFAX]* 28
    Station Planned for Far East *[TASS]* 29
    Further on Maritime Kray Plant *[Moscow Radio]* 29
Scientists Begin 'Apex' Space Project *[TASS]* 29
    'Magion-3' Separates *[TASS]* 29

Military

Troop Withdrawal From Germany on Schedule *[TASS]* 30
Division of Fleet Considered 'Difficult' *[Moscow TV]* 30
Concept of Joint Armed Forces Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 31 Dec]* 30
Commentary on Shaposhnikov Letter to PRAVDA *[PRAVDA 30 Dec]* 31
Lobov Speculates on Future of Army Reforms *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 21 Dec]* 32
Central Asian Servicemen Examine Possibilities *[Moscow Radio]* 34
Funding for Fledgling Armed Forces Difficult *[Russian TV]* 35

BALTIC COUNTRIES

Baltic Affairs

Talks on Commonwealth Postponed Until 6 Jan *[BALTFAX]* 36

Estonia

Troop Presence 'Contradicts' International Law *[BALTFAX]* 36

Latvia

Ministers View Fuel Shortage, Food Situation *[Riga Radio]* 36

Lithuania

Landsbergis Terms CIS 'Positive Phenomenon' *[Vilnius Radio]* 36
Politicians View Commonwealth Formation *[Vilnius International]* 37
Defense Minister To Head Border Committee *[Vilnius Radio]* 38
Government Legalizes Possession of Shotguns *[Vilnius Radio]* 38

RUSSIA

Commonwealth Issues

Yeltsin Decrees CIS Cooperation Committee *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 31 Dec]* 39
Mashits Comments on Appointment *[TASS]* 39
Burbulis Interviewed on Minsk Meeting Results *[Moscow TV]* 40
Burbulis Interviewed on Commonwealth Measures *[Russian TV]* 40
Filatov Interviewed on Minsk, Alma-Ata Talks *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 28 Dec]* 42

Economic Affairs

Government Approves Privatization Program *[IZVESTIYA 28 Dec]* 43
Gaydar Presents Privatization Program 30 Dec *[TASS]* 44
Gaydar Stresses Need To Stabilize Economy *[Moscow TV]* 47
Gaydar Interviewed on Economic Problems, Goals *[Moscow TV]* 47
Privatization Documents Said 'Rough Drafts' *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jan]* 48
State Committee's Chubays on Privatization *[Russian TV]* 48
Yeltsin Urged To Rethink Price Liberalization *[PRAVDA 30 Dec]* 49
Retail Price Rises, Ceilings Detailed *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 26 Dec]* 50
Burbulis, Deputies Meet on Economic Problems *[POSTFACTUM]* 51
Resolution on 1st Quarter 1992 Budget Plan *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 31 Dec]* 51
Aide Remarks on Currency Stabilization Fund *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Jan]* 52
Agricultural Bank To Succeed Agroprombank *[Moscow Radio]* 52
Agriculture Minister on Prospects, Problems *[Moscow TV]* 52

Security Issues

Filatov Criticizes Yeltsin Security Decree *[IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]* 52
Staffers Protest Merger Decree *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Dec]* 53
'Overwhelming Majority' Disapprove *[Radio Rossii]* 53
Security Minister Barannikov Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 31 Dec]* 53
Barannikov Unveils Crime-Fighting Measures *[Moscow Radio]* 56
Communications, Information Agency Created *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 28 Dec]* 57
State Committee for Emergencies Created *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 25 Dec]* 57

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Holds Session 26-27 Dec 59
Estonian Treaty Adopted *[Moscow TV]* 59
Antimonopoly Body Discussed *[PRAVDA 27 Dec]* 59
Profit Tax Set at 32% *[INTERFAX]* 59
Further on Debates *[PRAVDA 28 Dec]* 60
Presidium Meets; Defense Industry Viewed *[Radio Rossii]* 60
Zhirinovskiy Charges Commission With 'Slander' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Dec]* 60

Political & Social

Yeltsin Issues 'Urgent' Land Reform Decree *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 31 Dec]* 61
Individual Farms Exceed 40,000 *[Moscow International]* 62
Yeltsin Issues Decree on Foreign Ministry *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 24 Dec]* 63
Rutskoy Criticizes Government for 'Inactivity' *[TASS]* 63
Khasbulatov Reflects on 1991, 1992 Prospects *[Moscow TV]* 63
Khasbulatov on Changes, Yeltsin Role *[Radio Rossii]* 65
Burbulis Comments on Nuclear Weapons Control *[TASS]* 67
Zhirinovskiy Refutes Claims of KGB Ties *[TASS]* 68
Democratic Russia Appoints Political Council *[TASS]* 68
Officials Elected *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Research Center Forecasts Disintegration *[Moscow TV]* 68
Continuation of Space Program Discussed *[Russian TV]* 69

Media

Further on Yeltsin's Meeting With Media *[TRUD 25 Dec]* 69
Media Law Accused of 'Stifling' Press Freedom *[PRAVDA 27 Dec]* 70
All-Union Radio, TV To Become New Company *[Moscow Radio]* 70
Novgorod Oblast Radio, TV Company Reorganized *[Moscow Radio]* 70

Interrepublic Affairs

Yeltsin, Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan Sign Treaty *[TASS]* 70
    Yeltsin Comments on Ties *[Moscow TV]* 71

Regional Affairs

Yeltsin Grants Additional Powers to Popov *[Moscow Radio]* 71
Moscow Mayor Opposes New City Status Law *[TRUD 25 Dec]* 71
Moscow Sets Up New Militia; Nikitin Appointed *[TASS]* 72
    Further on 'Safety' Militia *[IZVESTIYA 26 Dec]* 72
'Uncontrolled Prices' Affect Moscow Shoppers *[TASS]* 72
St. Petersburg Mayor Requests More Powers *[Radio Rossii]* 73
Allegation of Sobchak Bribery Investigated *[Radio Rossii]* 73
St. Petersburg Security Chief To Monitor Aid *[Moscow Radio]* 73
Chechen Republic Adopts Neutrality Declaration *[PRAVDA 27 Dec]* 73
Chechen-Ingush Leader on 'Difficult Legacy' *[Russian TV]* 73
Naval Nuclear Waste in Murmansk Reported *[Moscow TV]* 74
Murmansk To Withdraw 3 'Atomic Icebreakers' *[Radio Rossii]* 74
Tatarstan Groups Protest Joining Commonwealth *[Moscow Radio]* 74
Kamchatka Complains About Lack of Consultation *[Moscow TV]* 75
Far East Official Denies Separation Efforts *[Moscow TV]* 75
Balkar Referendum Held on Sovereignty *[Radio Rossii]* 76
Dock Workers' Strike Shuts Magadan Port *[TASS]* 76

International Affairs

Foreign Ministry Outlines Stand on Relations *[INTERFAX]* 76
Kozyrev on Russia's Changed Role in World *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jan]* 77
    Outlines Policy Direction *[Moscow TV]* 80
    On Competition of Ideas *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 28 Dec]* 81
    Assesses 'Positive Results' of 1991 *[Russian TV]* 82
Foreign Ministry Notes USSR as 'Successor' *[INTERFAX]* 83
China Recognizes Russia's Right to UN Seat *[TASS]* 83
Cambodia Recognizes Russia's Independence *[TASS]* 83
'Good Prospects' Seen for South Korean Ties *[TASS]* 83
Yeltsin Letter Given to South Korean Pastor *[TASS]* 84
Pacific Countries Ship Food to Far East Ports *[TASS]* 84
Aid to Kabul Halted; No Release of POW's *[INTERFAX]* 84
Military Advisers 'Expected' To Leave Syria *[Jerusalem TV]* 85
Romania Agrees to Long-Term Trade *[Moscow International]* 85
UK's Major on Russian EC, IMF Membership *[TASS]* 85
Moscow, St. Petersburg To Receive EC Aid *[INTERFAX]* 85
Vatican Recognizes Russian Federation *[TASS]* 85
Russia To Exchange Oil for Cuban Sugar *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Foreign Ministry Lauds OAS Efforts in Haiti *[TASS]* 86

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Belarus

Trade, Economic Agreement Signed With Armenia *[TASS]* 87

Moldova

Snegur Voices 'Confidence' in New Year Address *[TASS]* 87
President Signs Decree Raising Minimum Wage *[Moscow Radio]* 87
Resolution Passed on Non-Cash Payments *[INTERFAX]* 87

Ukraine

Republic Frees Prices, Tariffs 2 Jan *[Kiev Radio]* 87
Price Liberalization To Begin 10 Jan *[Moscow Radio]* 89
Official on Coupon Circulation Issues *[Kiev Radio]* 89
Kravchuk Comments on Minsk Meeting Results *[TASS]* 90
  Minister Notes 'Positive' Talks *[Kiev Radio]* 90
Kiev Reduces Alert Status on Nuclear Weapons *[Moscow TV]* 91
Spokesman on Armed Forces Subordination *[TASS]* 91
USSR Minister on Armed Forces Formation *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Dec]* 91
President Appoints New Deputy Prime Minister *[Kiev Radio]* 92

CAUCASUS

Azerbaijan

Presidential Rule Introduced in 'Some Areas' *[TASS]* 93
President Mutalibov on Minsk CIS Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 93
NKAO Seeks UN Recognition, Troops *[INTERFAX]* 93
Stepanakert Shelled; Settlement Attacked *[TASS]* 93

Georgia

Economic Situation Termed 'Catastrophic' *[Russian TV]* 93
Reportage Updates Increased Tbilisi Violence 94
  Deputy Defense Minister Said Executed *[Hamburg DPA]* 94
  Execution 'Not Confirmed' *[Radio Rossii]* 94
  Foreign Minister Said Arrested *[TASS]* 94
  'Amateur Radio' Criticizes Opposition *[TASS]* 94
  Opposition Discusses Forming Coalition *[Moscow Radio]* 94
  Airport Runway Mined *[TASS]* 95
  Government House Storming 'Inevitable' *[Moscow Radio]* 95
  Conflict 'Spreading Out' *[TASS]* 95
  Russia Urged To Support President *[TASS]* 95
  'Fiercer' Fighting Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 96
  Opposition Leaders Meet Moscow Press *[IZVESTIYA 26 Dec]* 96
Clashes Continue in South Ossetia *[TASS]* 97

CENTRAL ASIA

Kyrgyzstan

Government To Free Prices With Russia *[Moscow TV]* 98
New 'Asaba' Party Registered 30 Dec *[INTERFAX]* 98

Tajikistan

Republic 'Toying' With Plans To Sell Uranium *[Hamburg DPA]* 98

Turkmenia

President Issues Decrees on Banks, Wages *[Ashkhabad Radio]* 98

Uzbekistan

Karimov on Conventional Forces Subordination *[Moscow TV]* 99
Supreme Soviet To Convene 4 Jan *[Tashkent Radio]* 99
Opposition To Continue Fight for Democracy *[INTERFAX]* 99
Bush Sends Message to Uzbekistan President *[INTERFAX]* 99
North Korea Ready To Establish Relations *[TASS]* 100

Arms Control & Disarmament

IZVESTIYA Views U.S. Disarmament Aid

PM0201101592 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 92 Union Edition p 7

[Article by G. Deynichenko: "How To Spend $400 Million?"]

[Text] During his trip to Moscow, Bishkek, Alma-Ata, Minsk, and Kiev, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, listening to assurances from his interlocutors regarding the reliability of control over Soviet nuclear arsenals, in turn promised extensive aid in ensuring security and dismantling nuclear arms on the territory of the former Union.

Baker's promises are based on the U.S. Congress decision on the appropriation of $400 million to organize this aid. Let us recall that the foundation to this plan was laid by the initiative of the chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees. Both chairmen—S. Nunn and L. Aspin—suggested earmarking $1 billion from the Pentagon budget to render aid to the Soviet Union. This idea was sharply criticized in Congress, which obliged its authors to remove their proposal from the discussion.

But the seed which had been thrown out nonetheless produced shoots. At the very end of November a group of senators and congressmen including S. Nunn and L. Aspin came out with a draft for a special legislative initiative providing for the earmarking, again through the reduction of the Pentagon budget, of $700 million for aid to the Soviet Union. This time it was a case not of aid in general but of its specific aims. It is planned to allocate $200 million for urgent humanitarian medical and food aid while $100 million will go to pay the Pentagon's expenses in transporting this freight to the former Soviet Union using U.S. military transport aircraft. It is planned to put the remaining $400 million into rendering technical assistance in eliminating Soviet nuclear weapons. This proposal was approved by Congress.

The fact that consignments of U.S. medical supplies and food are arriving in Moscow indicates that the first two parts of the aid plan are already being implemented. Its third component—the $400 million—requires lengthier and deeper talks.

The Strategic Offensive Arms Limitation Treaty concluded in July this year between the United States and the USSR provides for a substantial reduction (by one third) of delivery vehicles, but does not demand the elimination of the nuclear weapons themselves. However, so many of them have been stockpiled that both we and the Americans are faced with the need to eliminate them. That is a very complex technological problem. Even the storage of nuclear weapons is a complex task. To judge by U.S. press reports, U.S. plans for the use of the appropriations earmarked for Moscow are as yet far from specific. So far there is talk of recruiting U.S. specialists to resolve these problems in our countries and even of the Americans' virtual purchase of Soviet nuclear arms—obviously for their subsequent dismantling.

THE NEW YORK TIMES quotes a statement by a leader of the Soviet Ministry of Nuclear Power Engineering, assessing it as "the most detailed description" of what Moscow intends to do with the earmarked $400 million. According to this statement it is planned to use the U.S. appropriations to equip one of two establishments for storing fissionable materials from the warheads which have been taken out of commission. As a whole, according to the Soviet ministry worker, 10 years and $2 billion will be needed to eliminate the tactical nuclear weapons in the possession of the states belonging to the new Commonwealth.

United States & Canada

U.S. Response to Alma-Ata Meeting Cited

PM3112150591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by correspondents A. Blinov in Washington and A. Shalnev in New York: "James Baker's Doubts"]

[Text] The U.S. Administration has expressed "great satisfaction" over the signing of the agreement on the creation of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States]. It is expected that before the end of the year Washington will announce its official recognition of the states belonging to the CIS.

"We hope that the agreement will help ensure stable and peaceful conditions enabling the individual republics to proceed along the path of democracy and market reforms," White House press aide Judy Smith stated.

The brief statement by a White House official spokesman anticipates a vigorous discussion of the question of the creation of the CIS by U.S. President G. Bush and Secretary of State J. Baker.

According to news reports, the leader of U.S. diplomacy received information on the results of the Alma-Ata meeting directly on board an aircraft during a flight from Brussels to Washington. Kazakhstan President N. Nazarbayev telephoned him.

J. Baker is pleased that the leaders of the republics belonging to the community have emphasized their adherence to principles of democracy and respect for the rights of the individual and minority rights. At the same time the U.S. secretary of state returned from a tour of the former Soviet Union with a large share of skepticism as to how long the Commonwealth which has just been formed may exist. The secretary believes that Washington "will soon have to deal with a dozen independent states pursuing different policies and with different chances of success."

"According to this viewpoint," NEW YORK TIMES State Department correspondent Thomas Friedman writes in an article in that paper, "the former Soviet republics are now so in love with the idea of independence that they will be simply unable to work together in the Commonwealth and follow a common economic and military policy."

The WASHINGTON POST and NEW YORK TIMES correspondents who accompanied him on the trip report that J. Baker was struck by the degree of economic collapse in Russia and the seriousness of the economic difficulties threatening it. He does not rule out the possibility of disturbances on Russian territory unless prompt aid is rendered to it. The secretary of state and those accompanying him noted the seriousness of national-ethnic contradictions in Russia.

The West will believe that it has been lucky if the Comonwealth is able at least to pursue a common defense policy—with a single nuclear command—until nuclear arsenals are dismantled in all republics except Russia, but that too is in doubt.

The "competition for pro-Americanism" perplexes Baker, to say the least, T. Friedman writes. Wherever he went the local leaders seemed to be vying with each other to see which of them was most pro-American, most pro-democratic and pro-capitalist. Kirghiz President Askar Akayev succeeded in this more than the others. But the praise of the United States instilled disquiet. Sometimes it seemed, the journalist writes, that we had before us demonstrations in a spirit of "mere decoration."

The NEW YORK TIMES correspondent dwelled in particular on the problem of Washington's attitude toward the Russian president. He said that U.S. officials do not like Yeltsin. That is partly because from their viewpoint he is less predictable than Gorbachev. Here are the expressions which officials use to describe Yeltsin: "populist," "impulsive," "rude," and "peasant-like."

"Although we like Yeltsin's policy more, he nonetheless makes a repulsive impression. The haste with which he drove the final nails into the coffins of Gorbachev and Shevardnadze made us shudder," T. Friedman writes, citing the words of an official who, to judge by a number of indications, is Baker himself. As a whole, according to J. Baker's statements, the republics which have displayed adherence to democracy and market reforms deserve additional aid during the present winter. The United States will later pay special attention to supporting the republics as "little islands of democracy."

State Department Said To Seek New Missions

LD0201062692 Moscow TASS in English 0616 GMT 2 Jan 92

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Berezhkov]

[Text] Washington January 2 TASS—The U.S. State Department is on the lookout for specialists to work in the member-countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States in the wake of the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

As soon as the U.S. Administration announced diplomatic recognition of a number of former Soviet Republics as independent states, this called for the opening of about ten new diplomatic and consular missions and providing them with sufficient staff—from ambassadors to book-keepers and guards.

Item one on this agenda covers Ukraine, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan and Armenia, where diplomatic and consular missions will soon open, according to sources at the State Department, AP reports.

In addition, the State Department is considering the opening of U.S. consular offices in Khabarovsk and Yekaterinburg.

It turns out though that the selection of staffers is not half as difficult as finding and fitting out premises for new U.S. missions. The U.S. Administration is not in the habit of leasing premises. It prefers buying land and buildings to house U.S. Embassies. This time, American diplomats will probably seek accommodation in hotels, where they are also planning to open their offices. But already next month, working groups will travel to the Commonwealth of Independent States to choose plots of land for diplomatic missions and tackle other technical problems relating to their functioning.

U.S. President's Tour Linked to Economy

PM0201100992 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Dec 91 Union Edition p 10

["Editorial Office Viewpoint": "President Bush's Tour of Asia and New Opportunities for the Russian Economy"]

[Text] Next week U.S. President Bush will finally carry out his long-planned visit to Australia, Singapore, South Korea, and Japan. The trip was put off once because of sharp criticism. The President was reproached for paying undue attention to foreign affairs to the detriment of domestic ones. The reproach is a serious one, particularly because of the deep recession in an election year.

It is thought that this trip will be the most difficult one for the President in his whole career. Never before has the mighty United States depended so strongly on the favor of its partners. It is particularly galling for Americans that these were junior partners until quite recently.

All these countries are thriving while America has an adverse trade balance with them all.

Relations with Japan are particularly instructive. Japanese acquisitions in America have long been proverbial.

Only Japanese televisions are assembled in the United States, and half the American population will soon be driving Japanese cars.

A mood in favor of trade barriers has long been developing in America. The three giant auto manufacturers in Detroit are demanding protection from Japan. It is significant that the heads of the three concerns are accompanying the president on this trip.

Bush's first meeting with the new Japanese prime minister, K. Miyazawa, will not of course be marked by loud wrangling. Each side's might demands respect.

But the prospects for mutual satisfaction are slim. This means that the likelihood of some form of barriers to protect the American market against Japanese penetration increases. This has long been demanded by the Democrats. The President has resisted isolationism to the utmost. But the recession and unemployment are weighty arguments on his opponents' lips.

If the leaders of Russian industry study closely the results of Bush's trip, they will see new opportunities for themselves. A little ray of hope could appear in the tough investments market. In Russia and particularly in the Far East the propitious moment should not be missed.

By quickly and boldly offering foreign investors, above all Japanese and American ones, guarantees of profitable investments, the Russians could redress the present unfavorable trends. It is time to demonstrate by action that the former sluggishness and uncertainty are being replaced by an aggressive and far-sighted economic policy.

China

PRC Official on 'Recognitions Package'

PM3112151391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Dec 91 Union Edition p 5

[Correspondent Yu. Savenkov report: "China: Recognitions Package Ahead of New Year"]

[Text] Beijing—As already reported, China has officially recognized Russia and the 11 other independent republics (diplomatic relations with the Baltic republics were established earlier).

PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen has sent Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev a telegram confirming that the PRC Government recognizes the Russian Federation's independence and is appointing its ambassador to the former USSR as China's ambassador to Russia. Qian Qichen also sent telegrams to the foreign ministers of 11 other republics, including Georgia, recognizing their independence and expressing readiness to hold talks with them on establishing diplomatic relations.

The Chinese foreign minister does not specifically mention the Commonwealth of Independent States and does not make an assessment of it. But in private conversations many people in China are expressing doubt as to the legality of this act. At the same time a commentary from the official XINHUA agency expresses the hope that the Commonwealth that has succeeded the Union will bring stability to society and development to the economy.

There is no secret about the fact that China, while professing a pragmatic approach toward what is happening on the territory of the former USSR, is essentially unhappy at the disintegration of the Union, the defeat of the socialist idea in East Europe and the Soviet Union, and the ideological disagreement with them. As Premier Li Peng recently declared, "the changes have brought great chaos and unpredictability."

A long review by XINHUA described in detail the sharp political changes in the former Soviet Union, the exacerbation of interethnic conflicts, the economic crisis, the destabilization of society, the decline in social production, the headlong growth of the budget deficit, and the galloping inflation. This is discussed against the backdrop of the abolition of the CPSU's leading role, the emergence of a multiparty system and political pluralism, and the movement toward privatization. The implication is clear: China is enjoying economic growth and political stability, and the example of the former USSR shows what happens if someone turns aside from the correct policy of the Communist Party....

At a news conference yesterday Yuan Mu, speaker of the PRC State Council, was asked to explain the reason for the harsh criticism of M.S. Gorbachev by the Chinese press. Yuan Mu did not agree that it is condemning Gorbachev (for the sake of justice I would note that XINHUA's remark that "the new thinking, glasnost, and political pluralism proposed by Gorbachev brought political chaos, ethnic strife, and economic crisis" was not carried in the Chinese press). Yuan Mu repeated the official Chinese viewpoint that the peoples of the republics of the former Union must make their assessment of Gorbachev, but he reserved the right to express his own assessment later.

As for the attitude toward the personality of M.S. Gorbachev in Chinese society, it has undergone a series of changes. The repeated reprints of his book "Perestroyka and the New Thinking, Glasnost, and Poli- [line apparently dropped at this point] by publishing houses on the eve of his historic visit in May 1989, which marked the total normalization of relations, are very revealing. The first top Soviet leader to set foot on Chinese soil for 30 years saw, in the words of the Beijing weekly BEIJING REVIEW, "the biggest movement for democracy in the history of the ancient civilization." The students who filled Beijing streets and squares in those turbulent days greeted him as a supporter of liberal reforms. But after the Tiananmen tragedy Beijing's policy tilted toward more rigid ideologization.

Events in the Soviet Union began to develop differently, and as they changed Beijing's official attitude to Gorbachev also changed, though admittedly it was not expressed aloud. But in confidential documents studied in Chinese society Gorbachev was described as a "restorer of capitalism who has betrayed the cause of socialism." At political study courses students were told: The chaos in the Soviet Union is an illustration of what can happen in a country if liberalization goes too far and the role of the Communist Party is undermined. At the same time the leadership is declaring that China will travel its chosen socialist path, and events in the former Soviet Union will not influence the country.

Commenting on Beijing's decision to recognize the former Soviet republics, observers have also noted that China has recognized Georgia, although so far few countries have done so. Clearly, China's position on the human rights question played a part here. Beijing insists that the human rights situation cannot be grounds for interference in a state's internal affairs.

Who knows, maybe Chinese people's traditional wish—part of the nation's genetic code—to pay off all debts and settle problems ahead of the New Year also played a part in the speedy recognition of Georgia.

Beijing Official Comments on Talks, Ties

OW3112221391 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 2200 GMT 30 Dec 91

[From the "Hello China" program]

[Text] Dear listeners, an important event in relations between our country and China took place over the last few days of 1991. We have reported on the Russian-Chinese political consultations in Moscow which were conducted by the foreign affairs organs of our two countries. Earlier the two sides held consultations on such issues as bilateral relations, Middle East peace, and the Cambodian question. This time the talks were a little different than before; they began when Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen sent to Moscow a message saying China recognizes the independence of Russia, and the Chinese ambassador to the Soviet Union would become the Chinese ambassador to the Russian Federation. Consultations were recently held between Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze and Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Tian Zengpei. After their meeting was over, the two diplomats were interviewed by Moscow radio correspondent (Chalibov).

Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze said: The consultations took only a short time because the two sides hold identical views on many issues. We have pointed out, with satisfaction, our mutual understanding—as successor to the Soviet Union, Russia will completely continue relations with China and is ready to act in accordance with the basic principles of the 1989 and 1991 joint communiques; Russia will also develop good-neighborly and equal relations with China in all fields. We are satisfied that the Chinese Government recognizes the Russian Federation's right to succeed the former Soviet Union as a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council. We have discussed practical questions on how to develop bilateral relations in the days to come. They involve continuation of boundary talks, mutual disarmament in border areas, and confidence-building measures. They also involve some issues which were not yet settled before the disintegration of the Soviet Union, such as ratification of the agreement on the eastern section of the Soviet-Chinese boundary as well as other issues. I may say that after rational discussion of the present situation, we have to a great extent reached a mutual understanding.

In summing up the results of the Russian-Chinese political consultations, Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Tian Zengpei said: [begin recording] We have come to Moscow to discuss with the Russian Federation relations between our two countries. We have held good consultations and exchanged views on how to develop Chinese-Russian relations today. The two sides share the view that long, good relations exist between the two countries, and that traditional friendship exists between the Chinese and Russian people. Under the new situation, the two sides agree that the friendly relations between our two countries should continue, and friendly relations and cooperation in all fields between them should grow further on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence. China's consistent stand is one of respecting the choice of the people of other countries and not interfering with other's internal affairs. For this reason, we believe the prospects are very good for us to develop bilateral relations on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence. We share the view that the principles embodied in the two joint communiques signed between China and the Soviet Union in 1989 and 1991 should be the principle and basis for developing Chinese-Russian relations. Both the PRC Government and the Russian Federal Government are willing to carry out the treaties and agreements signed earlier between China and the former Soviet Union. We hope that consultations will make the bilateral relations grow further. I wish the Russian people a Happy New Year, and hope that the friendship between the Chinese and Russian people, and the friendly and cooperative relations between our two countries, will be further enhanced in the new year. [end recording]

Northeast Asia

Interview on KAL Disaster Reported

92UM0286A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 91 Union Edition p 8

[Article by IZVESTIYA special correspondent Aleksandr Shalnev: "Mystery of the Korean Boeing-747: Interviewing a Dead Man"]

[Text] Seoul-New York—The dead man's voice was quite cheerful, even gay.

"They do it out of spite," said the dead man and laughed.

A couple of days before I met him, I was told categorically at the Korean Air Lines headquarters: "Pak died three years ago."

On the tragic night of 31 August to 1 September 1983, Pak Yong Man, a retired colonel of the South Korean Air Force, was at the controls of a Boeing-747, Flight 015, flying the Los Angeles-Anchorage-Seoul route. KAL-015 left Anchorage 15 minutes after KAL-007 had taken off from the same airport, only to crash into the sea near the Sakhalin several hours later.

Both Boeings were supposed to follow the same route—Romeo-20, known by its abbreviation, R-20. The captains of both aircraft had flown this route many times—both Colonel Pak and his former subordinate in the Air Force and close friend, KAL-007 Captain Chang Byung In.

KAL-015 arrived at the Seoul's Kimpo Airport on schedule, almost to the minute.

KAL-007 was shot down by Soviet Su-15's missiles.

KAL-007 and KAL-015 had entered the tragedy together. According to some versions that have started to appear lately, this "togetherness" is not accidental at all. It was quite intentional. American researchers Robert Allardice and James Hollin, whose work IZVESTIYA has described in the past, came to the conclusion that KAL-015 had served as a sort of a cover for KAL-007 while the latter was "messing around" in the Soviet airspace.

I asked the retired colonel of the South Korean Air Force this question directly. Is it true, I asked, that you were also a direct participant of the events that took place during the flight from Anchorage to Seoul? Pak, who left Korean Air Lines amidst scandal a year after the tragedy and has been living since on his military pension, completely denies his involvement in any secret schemes—if such existed in the first place.

What he does not deny is the fault of the KAL-007 captain.

"Chang," he says, "is 100 percent at fault. As well as there being a 100-percent fault of American radar operators tracking the flight and, of course, of your military pilot who shot down the Boeing. These three are the main guilty parties in the tragedy."

...My trip to Seoul was supposed to take place a year ago. Almost everything was ready, but the trip had to be canceled: It was hinted to me through various channels that I was, of course, free to travel to Seoul, but none of the people I absolutely had to see would be there to see me.

Later, we were able to deduce that both Seoul and Moscow were equally interested in not letting the IZVESTIYA investigation spread to Korean soil. They had just started to establish diplomatic relations between themselves; the issue of financial and economic aid to us from Korea was about to be resolved; therefore, journalists' attempts to barge into this not only tragic but also very delicate area were, in the opinion of both sides, highly untimely. Now the situation is different, a high-ranking South Korean official told me: "Even if the entire truth comes out, nothing will overshadow the relations between our countries now. Nothing will sway them."

Perhaps, this confidence is the reason why this time I received relatively quickly not only the official Seoul blessing, but also its very substantial help in setting up the meetings I needed. The only things they could not arrange were meetings in the Ministry of Defense and with the airline's top executives.

Korean Air Lines is a privately-owned company, and although the Korean Government, it seems, has some leverage there, this time it had not worked. Or, perhaps, it had not been applied with due force. On the other hand, I learned from a fully reliable source that one of government agencies had lodged an official protest with Korean Air Lines for feeding me blatant disinformation on the demise of Col. Pak.

Now let us move from the "dead man" to news. Going through the archives of the ministry of transportation, I stumbled upon a number of interesting documents. The one worth mentioning first is a memo prepared by the staff of the ministry's civil aviation administration for the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), whose delegation came to Seoul in September 1983 to conduct a preliminary investigation.

The memo contains information that had not been in any way reflected in the official report presented to the ICAO by the government of South Korea, although, in my view, this information is important. It describes the KAL-007 captain in this way: "Interviews with pilots who had been flying with Chang during the last few months indicate that Chang had been exceptionally meticulous in checking and rechecking navigational gear on board... Conceivable deviations should have been detected by an experienced crew before these deviations could grow into a serious problem."

This passage is absent from the government commission's final report. What it tells us is that if a mistake had been made in programming the flight route, Chang's crew should have immediately detected it and, upon detection, corrected it. If they did not correct it, it was either because it "had to be done that way"—it was necessary for the KAL-007 to fly over the Kamchatka and Sakhalin. Or...

The KAL-015 captain: "I cannot imagine," he told me, "that Chang would have agreed to a dangerous intelligence mission knowing how many lives he would endanger. But I can easily presume something else—again, based on my many years of close relationship with him: The second pilot and the navigator put the route program into the inertial navigation device computer in Anchorage. While running a check, Chang discovered the mistake—he was a very meticulous man. Still, he decided to take off, counting on the fact that he had flown the R-20 route many times and hoping to easily correct the mistake while in flight. The deviation from the route started as soon they took off. Strictly speaking, he should have dumped the fuel and returned to Anchorage to reprogram the navigational device. The return could have cost him dearly, however: The company would not have forgiven him the waste of fuel and the flight delay. Korean Air is a demanding company."

(By the way, it follows from the Ministry of Transportation documents I had an opportunity to peruse that the crew had had continuous problems with at least one of the three inertial navigation systems of the downed Boeing. During the last days of August, this system had been replaced at least twice, or, judging by some documents, thrice. With an interval of three to five days. The last time it took place was on 29 August. The next day, 30 August, KAL-007 left New York for Anchorage. From there, on the 31, it was to continue to Seoul. Was the system operating properly on the day of departure? And if not, how reliable was the "backup" provided by the other two systems?)

What happened next?

"Next," believes Col. Pak, "the deviation from the route kept increasing. They were not able to put themselves onto the R-20 route. My guess is that Chang attempted to fly by the onboard radar but was confused by the contour similarity of Shemya Island, which appears on the starboard side of the R-20 route, and one of your islands. It also appeared on the radar on the starboard side, and Chang assumed it was Shemya. If it was Shemya, he decided, he was following the correct route. He probably did not realize that the KAL-007 was already several hundred kilometers off course to the north and was heading straight for Kamchatka."

[Shalnev] You left Anchorage 15 minutes after KAL-007 took off. Were you talking to 007?

[Pak] Of course. But only later, after the event, did I realize that our radio conversations were not as frequent as they usually are when two planes of the same company fly along the same route in an almost empty night sky and the pilots know each other very well.

[Shalnev] Do you remember your last conversation with him?

[Pak] Yes. At some point it became clear from the radio contact with Chang that he was behind schedule. There could be only two reasons for the delay: a failed engine or strong head wind. When I contacted Chang, he said that the wind was very strong. "That's odd," I remarked, "I do not have it here." I was flying a 14-minute flight distance from him, which means I should have been encountering the same weather conditions. Only later, on the ground, when I learned what had happened, did I realize that Chang simply had lied to me. He could not say openly that he had strayed from the course—the KAL company would have punished him severely. He was still certain that he would find the right course. He had flown that route so often that he was convinced he would find it, but he needed more time. I contacted him again and repeated again: "I do not have any wind." But he already stopped answering me.

(According to the information I received from a man who had been in intensive contact with Col. Pak, this last radio contact between KAL-007 and KAL-015 had a different ending: Pak did warn Chang that the latter probably had strayed off the route. That is when the airwaves went silent. Col. Pak, however, did not confirm this version in his conversation with me.)

"Tell me, why did the American radar operators not warn the Boeing when it entered the buffer zone—the completely closed zone between the United States and the Soviet Union?"

"Good question. I think that for the Americans it was a good opportunity to test the 'responsiveness' of the Soviet air defense system. They did not think that the aircraft would be shot down. 'The worst that can happen,' they probably thought, 'is that the Soviet interceptors will force it to land.' So they let the Boeing through! I already said: Americans are just as 100-percent at fault as Chang and the pilot of your interceptor are."

Back to the archives of the Ministry of Transportation and those eleven folders marked simply "KAL-007." The official report sent by the South Korean Government to the ICAO in the fall of 1983 says: "The true route of KAL-007 flight still remains unclear, since important information is missing, including the contents of the black boxes." However, a memo prepared by the ministry staff for the ICAO investigators, has an appendix—a schematic map where this "unknown" route is marked in red. The map also shows the coordinates of the Boeing's crash site. The coordinates that are very close to actual ones.

I also discovered in the archives a report dated April 1984. Here is the part called "Conclusions." The three main points in this part: "Believe that the aircraft was taking a wrong route," "We do not know exactly the reason why the deviation from the route took place," and "The crew did not know they were off course." The third conclusion, as one may notice, contradicts what Col. Pak was saying and what had been said about the KAL-007 captain in the memo for the ICAO group ("Very meticulous in checking and rechecking...").

What can we expect from now on? The South Korean Government is waiting for Moscow to make public the information from the "black boxes." "And until then you do not intend to conduct your own investigation?" I asked Lee Loo Hyuk, director of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs First East European Division that handles Soviet affairs. The substance of his reply was: No, we do not. "We do not have," said the director, "any information."

I heard more or less the same in the Ministry of Transportation, in the Korean Bar Association, and from the president of the Korean Association of KAL-007 Victims' Families. "The first move," they said, "is up to Moscow. We cannot conduct our investigation without the help from the Soviet Government."

Interesting, I wondered, how does IZVESTIYA conduct its investigation without any help from the Soviet (or any other) Government? My interlocutors readily marveled together with me.

Yu In Hak, the vice president of the Association of Victims' Families, also represents a new democratic party in the South Korean National Assembly; he did go a bit further and expressed dismay that the "government drag on the investigation," and that "the government should request from the United States true information about the event." At the same time, the parliament member hinted at some "under the table," as he put it, deal between the Soviet and Korean governments—a deal intended to let the matter die quietly.

The need to get information not only from Moscow, but also from Washington and Tokyo, was mentioned to me by Lee Byung Ho, one of most prominent South Korean lawyers and president of the Asian-Pacific Region Bar Association. "It is, however, exceptionally difficult—practically impossible—to get the needed materials from American and Japanese intelligence. These materials are needed, however, in order to establish the truth."

Both the Bar Association, and the Association of Victims' Families are thinking about creating special groups that would undertake the investigation of the tragedy over the Sakhalin. Hon Hyung Mo, president of the families' association, who lost his wife on that night, is hoping—should the group travel to the Soviet Union—to meet with Colonel Osipovich, the pilot, and asked IZVESTIYA to help him in this.

There was also this plea (actually, I heard it from practically everybody in Seoul): "Please continue your investigation. Dig up the 'black boxes.' Start a campaign to collect money to erect on Sakhalin a monument to those who had perished in the night of 1 September 1983."

...Of the three who (in Col. Pak's belief) are responsible for the KAL-007 tragedy, Osipovich has already told his part. What about the others? Why do those who are still holding the "black boxes" remain silent?

P.S. The latest from Washington: The United States Supreme Court upheld the lower court decision that the KAL-007 crew had been guilty of criminal negligence. Now the way is cleared for the victims' families to bring action against Korean Air Lines and to seek monetary compensation. It may cost the airline tens, or even hundreds, of millions of dollars.

Near East & South Asia

Commentary on Halting Arms for Afghanistan

LD0101184692 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Commentary by Aleksey Kondratyev on Moscow-Washington agreement on halting arms supplies to Afghan warring factions]

[Text] No Soviet heavy cargo planes landed at Kabul airport in the past two weeks in accordance with the Russian Government's decision to stop supplying weapons to the Kabul regime ahead of time fixed in the September agreement with the United States. Some sources say Washington cut off its military to the Afghan opposition last October. Afghanistan is no more regarded as an arena of confrontation between the United States and the former Soviet Union.

It is no secret that for about 13 years the Afghan conflict was being fed by Soviet and American weapons. Although the mujahidin got weapons from other sources too, the United States and the Soviet Union were the main arms suppliers.

The joint Soviet-American agreement in respect to the Afghan conflict can hardly be overestimated. It is a major step toward a peace settlement in Afghanistan. The Kabul regime and the mujahidin leaders can no longer count on the guaranteed flow of weapons, the instructions on how to use them from military experts, as well as subsidies for arms purchases. Cutting off military aid means there will be no new casualties and destructions of the long-suffering Afghan land. This will undoubtedly bring the Afghan warring factions to think about peaceful ways to settle the crisis.

There are fears, however, that other sources to finance arms purchases may appear. For one, the mujahidin may use money coming from drug dealing for buying weapons. That's why it is important that an effective international mechanism should be set up to control the stopping of arms supplies to Afghanistan from Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and other states. Regrettably such a mechanism has not yet been worked out.

The Kabul regime has favored the joint step by Moscow and Washington, regarding it as a part of the Afghan settlement. The mujahidin leaders, too, responded positively to this measure. What arouses concern, though, is that they refuse to go to the negotiating table with Najibollah. Perhaps they will even try to step up hositilities, hoping the termination of military aid will undermine the strength of the Kabul regime. This always seems to be a dangerous illusion, for Kabul has enough weapons to defend itself. Besides, it has many supporters ready to help resist any military attack. This makes a cease-fire and a peaceful dialogue the only means of obtaining peace in Afghanistan, just as it is envisaged by the United Nations plan on settlement in that country.

East Europe

CSFR's Havel Pays Tribute to Gorbachev

*PM0201134992 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Dec 91 p 5*

[Andrey Krushinskiy report under the rubric "Heritage and Heirs": "Giant or Bungler?"]

[Excerpt] Prague—In view of the important events taking place in our country, the Czechoslovak Government has had to work even on Christmas: At its session held at the end of last week, it welcomed the formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States. Deputy Prime Minister J. Dienstbier said that the CSFR recognizes the succession of Russia as the legal successor to the USSR in international organizations, including the UN Security Council, although the recently initialled Czechoslovak-Soviet treaty "will not be automatically transferred to the Russian Federation."

At the same time CSFR President V. Havel sent M. Gorbachev a telegram expressing thanks for his policy of democratization and perestroyka. "By this you helped many people," the telegram says, "...You helped us too—Czechoslovakia and the other states of central Europe." [passage omitted]

Political & Social

Gorbachev Reveals Plans Following Telecast

'Staying in Politics'

PM3112103091 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 27 Dec 91 p 1, 2, 3

[Interview with former President Mikhail Gorbachev by Fiammetta Cucurnia and Enrico Franceschini in Moscow on 26 December]

[Text] Moscow—"I think that eventually history will prove me right. I have had a unique destiny, of which I am proud. I am leaving the post of president, but I am staying in politics." Interviewed by LA REPUBBLICA, Mikhail Gorbachev took stock of his years at the head of the superpower that no longer exists, but did not admit defeat. The former Soviet president criticized Yeltsin—"his method is wrong, we disagree, but I will support him in the policy of democratic transformations. I will not join the opposition. It would not make sense for me to oppose the reforms." He issued a very worried assessment of the present situation: "The dissolution of the Union could take us away from democracy. The Alma-Ata meeting was like a cockfight." He was unconcerned about his own future. "I fear no reprisals. Now I will return to my family; there is some perestroyka needed there, too. My mother often used to say to me: 'Drop everything and come back home.'"

"I am leaving the post of president, but I am staying in politics. I am pleased to see you, first and foremost because you are Italians. I have a special affection for Italy. I remember my first meetings in Italy. The last time in Milan my life hung by a thread—and not only mine: A sea of Italians was pulling in all directions, and at one point I even lost [Prime Minister] Andreotti. You do not forget such feelings. I am pleased that the Italians have understood us. I wrote a letter to Andreotti, my friend Giulio. There is an 'Andreotti phenomenon,' the phenomenon of a great politician and a great intellectual, with whom it is always interesting to talk. We liked each other. Nothing ever separated us."

[LA REPUBBLICA] Mr. President, our first question is very simple: How do you feel this morning?

[Gorbachev] As you see me... Once a decision has been made, it is forgotten. The same happened to me in 1985, when I decided to start. Now it is the same. It is a logical choice, and not unexpected either. I said so: If the process of reform of our multinational state went beyond the limit of the disintegration of the USSR, there would no longer be a place for me. Now another life is starting. I have not been spoiled by life, which is why I am not afraid. I have already experienced everything. Perhaps this is the start of a much needed period of reflection for me.

[LA REPUBBLICA] You said on television that you are leaving your post with both anxiety and hope. What did you mean?

[Gorbachev] I weighed my words. I spoke of alarm because I would not want the process of forming independent states, that is, the breakup of the country, to take us outside the boundaries of democracy. It would be terrible for all of us and for everything we have done. We made such an effort to subdue this totalitarian monster and breathe life into a new body so that it could get going and overcome all the obstacles. And just at that moment we were hit by the putsch. I still believe it would have been better to create a new Union. However, I am a politician and if this Commonwealth offers a chance, I will do all I can to support it, so that it does not burst like a soap bubble, so that it becomes a real structure capable of uniting the different forces during this decisive phase. Not everything is clear about this Commonwealth yet; in fact all that has been made clear so far is nuclear weapons. I am worried about what is happening in Ukraine, and the press conference of eleven presidents at Alma-Ata seemed to me like a cockfight. I hope this is not a prophesy on my part. On 25 December I called Bush two hours before my television appearance and I said to him, "George, diplomatic recognition of the republics is necessary." But in recognizing the new states, the crucial thing is to support the Commonwealth so that it begins to exist, because if the mechanisms of interaction between the republics fail to function the results will be disastrous.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Do you think there is a real risk of this?

[Gorbachev] I think the possibility of keeping the process within the confines of democracy are stronger, because society understands too that we can only get out of the crisis if we pull together, and politicians understand that if things go differently then they will be swept away like men of a single season. I told Bush this. I said, "The world turned out like this over the period of a millennium and you cannot reshape it as though with a pair of scissors." If only it were that simple! I was already saying this two years ago. I said we can divide up power, but we cannot divide ourselves. Now there is no center any more, there is no Gorbachev either, and the republics must create new mechanisms, seeing that they are completely free at last.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Yeltsin argues that if a year ago you had accepted the idea of a confederation rather than a federation, the Union could have been saved.

[Gorbachev] Boris Nikolayevich's statements are often too political and lack a proper analysis. It is one way of expressing yourself, a particular style. It is an attempt to apportion blame for the current processes of disintegration. I am not accusing him. I simply mean that we forged an agreement to set the Union on new foundations, and it was ready just two days before the coup. It was the putschists who halted it. Otherwise we would have signed it. So what point is there in Yeltsin's saying such things if we were in agreement? It is irresponsible. I am justified in wondering: Did Yeltsin perhaps not agree with that which we were about to sign? A strange situation. There are so many contentious points in his speech that you lose the thread of his argument. In this instance I do not think that he is right. Unfortunately the coup ruined everything. Even the CPSU was transforming itself, adapting itself to political pluralism. The putschists realized that there would be no place for them in the new society.

[LA REPUBBLICA] In your speech on television you admitted you had made mistakes. Which were the most serious ones?

[Gorbachev] I should have taken advantage of the stability and popular consensus that existed in the first stage of perestroyka, and moved more swiftly toward a market economy. Then the negotiations on the Union treaty should have been brought forward a few months. But this would have required agreement among all the democratic forces, and instead they continued to quarrel and therefore became weakened compared with the conservatives. Last, not only was it necessary to destroy the old totalitarian system, it was also necessary to build a new system equally quickly. We destroyed without building and society found itself suspended between two voids—a suicidal position to be in. But none of this alters my fundamental choice, which I defend and which I am basically proud of, and that is my decision to begin the process of reform in 1985.

[LA REPUBBLICA] You long believed that the Communist Party could be reformed and become the vehicle for the democratic transformation of the USSR. Did you come to realize that this was not so, and, if so, when?

[Gorbachev] The country was in a terrible situation. The only thing that still worked competitively was the military sector. Everything had to be modernized. In 1987 we launched a plan to reform the entire economic system. Then we saw who was opposing the change: the party and the leading elements of the economic structure. The most onerous and exhausting of battles began. A battle which culminated in the August coup and the distressing destruction of the Soviet Union. At the January 1988 plenum we broached the issue of the reform of cadres, and the forces confronting us realized that things were becoming difficult for them. They did their utmost to disregard the results of the plenum and sabotaged it as best they could. Nothing: That plenum achieved nothing. That was when we decided to convene the 19th party conference, because it was clear that the revolution from the top was exhausted and we would not succeed in doing anything unless we found a way of involving the masses in this transformation. And to do this the party had to be deprived of its monopoly on legislative, executive, and judicial power. But, portrayed thus, this reform would never have prospered. So it had to be disguised. At that time the party had a most powerful structure which managed everything, which guided everything. It was the state-party. Not that it had received any such mandate from the people, but it had possessed it in practice since 1917; it had taken it and kept it. You will recall what a battle and what a turnabout occurred at that party conference. An enormous turnabout. A monstrous struggle began. It would have been unrealistic then to try to liquidate the party. There was no force that could stand up to it. Only through political reform was it possible to achieve free elections in order to generate new forces, representative bodies, and people's powers and to scale down the CPSU. But when this process began the party reacted very strongly. Every plenum was a battle between reformers and conservatives. Do you think that my hope of reforming the CPSU was unrealistic? No, I was the most realistic of all, because I realized that unless we isolated the party from the state structure, we would not achieve anything. And I was right. History will show it. I would hear comments—Gorbachev is veering to the right, slowing down, going astray—but I adhered resolutely to this line to the end. I had to nurture this process lest it grind to a halt. Look, even a year and a half or two years ago the party could still have regained everything, with no arguments. It had the Army on its side—the entire military-industrial complex, the cadres, everything.

[LA REPUBBLICA] But the world is still wondering what happened in the winter of 1990, during that which everyone has described as the "swing to the right"...

[Gorbachev] I explained this to Boris Nikolayevich, too, who disagrees with me, however: At that point I perceived that the whole of society was veering to the right. Perhaps in a final attempt to defend itself from instability. It seemed to me that in that chaos feelings of nostalgia for the past, for order and discipline, were gaining ground. Do you remember the 7 November parade when somebody produced portraits of Stalin? I think it was my duty to acknowledge this aspect, in order to be able to handle it so that it would not proceed too spontaneously. If that had happened, the democrats would have found themselves in very grave danger. But they did not understand this.

[LA REPUBBLICA] In the midst of this "swing to the right" Shevardnadze resigned as foreign minister, protesting about an imminent dictatorship. Would it have been better for you if he had not done so?

[Gorbachev] Yes, better. I persevered for a long time; for almost a month I tried to persuade him not to leave. But I could not fail to take account of what he said, because he was a friend, a real friend. Yes, it would have been better if he had stayed with me, but that could not have altered the situation substantially.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Would you still be president if the coup had not occurred?

[Gorbachev] It is not important who would have been president. I can tell you this: In order to persuade the republics to sign the new Union treaty I promised that I would never stand for the presidency and suggested drafting a proper contract—you sign the treaty, and I will leave.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Mikhail Sergeyevich, how has the experience of these seven terrible years in power marked you?

[Gorbachev] You know, I feel like I have lived so many lives in these seven years... I have changed together with the country, and on the other hand I have changed this country. From time to time I wonder whether I am happy with what I have done: I have to say that my destiny has been truly unique, special—to have brought about such profound reforms bound to economic, spiritual, and political freedom; to have restored eternal and universal values to society, to people... I am not disappointed with the destiny that has befallen me. And whatever happens from this day on, my destiny is complete.

[LA REPUBBLICA] The whole world has followed the rivalry between you and Boris Yeltsin, who has written in his autobiography: "If Yeltsin did not exist, Gorbachev would have had to invent him." What was this rivalry like for you?

[Gorbachev] It think there is a bit of exaggeration there; in the words of Boris Nikolayevich too. There are even deeper and older reasons. It all began before Yeltsin, when he was still at Sverdlovsk and had other things altogether on his mind, while we were already witnessing a series of signs that the system was dying. When I came to Moscow in 1978 (as secretary of the Central Committee—THE GUARDIAN note) I saw all this with my own eyes and it was then that the first long-term plans were born. Yeltsin had nothing to do with it at the time. Ours was a reaction not to Yeltsin's attitude but to what was happening in this country, in society and in the world. And had it not been for all the changes initiated by Khrushchev, and Kosygin's reforms which then got swallowed up by Brezhnev's reactionary regime, none of this would have happened. And it was all rubbish what they were saying at the time about the nonvitality of capitalism." All this goes to show that our country was "pregnant" with perestroyka and it just needed someone—and that someone was found—who had the strength to start this process off. If it hadn't been us it would have been others, because society as a whole was ready for this transition. Even in the party, despite resistance, there were men who felt the need for it. If it had just been me, if it had not been a collective need, perestroyka would not have gone ahead. What is dissidence if not the rejection of this society's dogmas? Spiritual and personal freedoms were being repressed and everything was moving toward an inevitable explosion.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Yeltsin's rancor toward you seems to stem from the treatment that he received in 1987, at the time of his expulsion from the Politburo...

[Gorbachev] This too was the natural development of an ongoing process. I backed Yeltsin when he worked in Moscow, because I realized what he was up against. I recently thought back over those events, and it seemed to me that perhaps Yeltsin was the first to have to confront a reaction similar to that which we too later encountered, within the party and society.

[LA REPUBBLICA] But perhaps he could have been brought back when he asked to be "rehabilitated" at the 19th conference...

[Gorbachev] Perhaps.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Your main dialogue was with the Russian intelligentsia, and at a certain point, they turned their back on you. Perhaps they did not understand you, or was it you who failed to understand how their minds work?

[Gorbachev] Yes, it was a question of psychology. But in politics there are also realities and obligations that cannot be avoided. At the beginning of the gestation period the intelligentsia were indispensable because, without them, no country can reach a state of awareness. But when the design has to be transformed into action, it is difficult for rulers and intellectuals to come together. The transition from philosophy to practice gives rise to the need for corrections dictated by life. That is why many grow disillusioned. In such cases, the intelligentsia think that they have been cast aside or betrayed. Nevertheless I have always respected them.

[LA REPUBBLICA] A few days ago Russia's deputy premier, Gennadiy Burbulis, said that there will be no persecution of those who helped to eliminate the totalitarian system. Do you feel secure? Are you not afraid of being turned into a scapegoat if things go wrong?

[Gorbachev] It often happens in history that when politicians suffer a defeat they try to divert people's attention. And when they can no longer manage the situation they seek a scapegoat. So anything is possible. But I am not worried. My conscience and history protect me. Whatever other may fabricate does not worry me: I hope that they will show their true face.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Many people have compared you to Peter the Great, as a Europeanizer and modernizer. But, unlike a tsar, you have tried to modernize the country using democratic methods. Do you think this is still possible?

[Gorbachev] Historical comparisons are often imprecise and dangerous. However, I am certain that the democratic way is still the only one possible. I am convinced that you cannot impose models on society, and I am not on the side of those who want to import Sweden or Italy into Russia, nor of those who see the Russian people as a race apart with a mission of its own. In short, I feel close to the European culture but my feet are firmly on the ground, divorced from the extremism of the Slavophiles and Westernists—two currents that have always conflicted in Russian culture. We are bound to Europe but also to Asia, and in this sense are unique, a necessary bridge between two cultures..

[LA REPUBBLICA] You still call yourself a socialist. Do you still think socialism is credible?

[Gorbachev] It is not socialism that has failed, but rather Stalinism in the guise of socialism. It was not socialism. On the contrary, it was the antithesis of socialism right from the start, because socialism means democracy, participation, freedom. It is the ultra-revolutionary model of socialism that has failed, the repressive one that reduced everything to the same level and ruled out all inquiry. I, on the other hand, feel I am part of a collective search for justice, freedom and democracy. And mankind will continue this quest which moves on different fronts and involves different ideals.

[LA REPUBBLICA] It is almost as though you were quoting Sakharov...

[Gorbachev] Yes, the theory of the convergence of the two worlds. The thinking of men like him, their moral authority, is very important for me.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Your speech on television yesterday seemed not like a good-bye but like a political manifesto. Is it that of a head of the opposition?

[Gorbachev] There could be no justification whatsoever for my going into opposition either from a political point of view or when it comes to the interests of the country. It would be absolutely unthinkable for Gorbachev to oppose reforms in Russia. I can advise and express opinions, but I agree with the basic reform policies and I say we must support the Russian leadership. I said this to Bush and to all the Western leaders. I also said to Yeltsin: "As long as Russia follows the path of democratic change, I will not only support it I will defend it, particularly at this difficult stage." If a different situation then develops, I shall have to think again. But at the moment I cannot envisage the idea of going into opposition. In opposition to what? To democratic reforms? To myself? Gorbachev is not like that, and everyone knows it.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Do you rule out standing in future as a candidate for an elective post? Or as a deputy? Or as Russian president?

[Gorbachev] From the very first day I deliberately began to share out the power that I possessed. So you can see that power is something not very close to my heart. I have different desires now. For instance, to be able to reflect and to share the fruits of my experience with others. I receive many suggestions from my foreign friends, but I think that I will concentrate my activity here in Russia. I have big plans.

[LA REPUBBLICA] What effect did it have on you seeing the red flag come down from the Kremlin?

[Gorbachev] The same as it did on all the citizens of this country. The red flag is our life. I don't want to dramatize this moment, out of respect and sensitivity toward my fellow countrymen, even though it is normal when a country ceases to exist for its symbols to disappear too. And yet, the red flag is an issue that touches us all deeply.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Do you think Lenin should stay in the mausoleum in Red Square?

[Gorbachev] If I had had to decide in 1924 I would have opposed it resolutely. But since that decision was made, we must now act in a cautious and a balanced manner. It is the country that must choose.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Mikhail Sergeyevich, you are leaving this post after seven years of terrible tensions, which your wife Raisa has shared in full. Do you not also feel a sense of release?

[Gorbachev] What a life my family have led during these years... I am very grateful for what they were able to endure. It was not easy. Now we will have a little perestroyka in the family, too, and some travel. After that our life, too, will become more normal again. But I must say that my family's mood now is similar to mine. I see no tragedies, and neither do my loved ones. It is a natural evolution... Thank God it is natural. In my country it has never happened before.

[LA REPUBBLICA] You do not seem sad...

[Gorbachev] "Vse normalno"—everything is fine.

Appeals for Aid

LD3012151891 Moscow TASS in English 0937 GMT 30 Dec 91

[By TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Bantin]

[Text] Tokyo December 30 TASS—Western countries should urgently give emergency food and medical aid to the former Soviet Republics to help avert possible large-scale social upheavals in the member countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), Mikhail Gorbachev said in an exclusive interview published in the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI SHIMBUN today.

He had met with Japanese journalists in the Kremlin a day after his recent televised address to the country, during which he announced his resignation from the post of the president of the Soviet Union.

Gorbachev expressed deep concern over the future of the recently established Commonwealth of Independent States, pointing out that the greatest difficulties await the former Soviet Republics in 1992-1993 when the first phase of the transition to a market economy will be effected.

Approximately a decade will be needed to create a financial and economic infrastructure corresponding to a market system, Gorbachev believes. He emphasised that he was still convinced about the need to create a single federation of the former Soviet Republics. "I think the future will prove the correctness of my point of view," Gorbachev said.

The nuclear weapons of the former Soviet Union are now under reliable control which is no less effective than at the time when the president of the USSR was the commander-in-chief of the Soviet Armed Forces, Gorbachev said.

At the same time he voiced concern over the possibility of an "outflow" of Soviet scientists and experts in the field of nuclear technologies of military purpose to those countries which now seek to possess nuclear weapons of their own.

Asked about his plans for the future, the former Soviet president pointed out that he did not intend to discontinue his political and public activities.

"I have got various plans of my own and there are offers concerning me. I must think them over and decide on which offer to choose within the next three weeks," Gorbachev said.

To Head 'Gorbachev Foundation'

PM0201112792 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by A. Illesh and S. Mostovshchikov: "After Resigning Mikhail Gorbachev Will Most Likely Head Gorbachev Foundation"]

[Text] According to reports received by IZVESTIYA Mikhail Gorbachev has already in fact found himself a new work place, but has not yet made the final decision. Most likely he will head an organization known as the Gorbachev Foundation. Its official name is Sociopolitical Research Foundation. It was created in August 1991 by a Gorbachev decree after his return from Foros.

About 200 people work in the foundation and their task is to prepare to order political forecasts for the top institutions of power of the former USSR and of Russia. The foundation also organizes international scientific conferences and meetings between politicians, analyzes foreign experience, trains parliamentarians, renders aid in organizing election campaigns, and engages in other applied activity promoting the pursuit of a skilled domestic and foreign policy. One of the foundation's recent works was the forecast of the situation in the country after the liberalization of prices. Among other consequences the possibility of a vast social eruption is not ruled out.

Aleksandr Galkin, director of the political forecasting institute which is part of the foundation's system, said that the question of Gorbachev becoming the foundation's chairman has been discussed seriously recently and it is merely a case of Gorbachev giving his consent, which has already been received unofficially. Aleksandr Galkin says that after Gorbachev has moved to it the foundation will be somewhat changed and its council will most likely be joined by major foreign politicians and possibly even presidents now in office. (According to IZVESTIYA's information, Margaret Thatcher, No Tae-u, and several other very eminent politicians have agreed to join it).

The organization, which Gorbachev will most likely head in the middle of 1992, plans to become absolutely independent of state structures. Already it receives no money from the state and lives on revenue from the foundation's hotel and simultaneous translation rooms, and other funds.

Shevardnadze Not 'Trying To Scare People'

924C0314A Moscow KURANTY in Russian 18 Dec 91 p 4

[Interview with Eduard Shevardnadze recorded by Nikolay Andreyev; place and date not given: "Eduard Shevardnadze: The Threat of an Explosion Persists"]

[Text] [Andreyev] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, you previously predicted a coup in our country. What do you think now, are we not threatened by a new putsch, a dictatorship?

[Shevardnadze] I am greatly concerned. What this should be called—putsch, uprising, explosion—I do not know, but such a threat persists. It is said that Shevardnadze is trying to scare people. No, I am not. Living conditions are deteriorating with every day that goes by; you live in Moscow and can see what is happening. And it will be even harder come January. Reassuring people that nothing will happen is simply immoral and irresponsible for a politician. The people must be told the truth. We now need to display vigilance and do everything to prevent anything worse.

[Andreyev] Your attitude toward the new commonwealth of states?

[Shevardnadze] I believe this is a positive trend and should be supported and developed in every possible way. There will be great difficulties on this path, of course, and the process will not be painless. For example, the USSR has 15,000 international agreements; who will bear the responsibility for them? Not all the republics will want to, I believe. And what about our embassies and trade missions abroad? The army, nuclear arms.... There are very many such complex questions, and they cannot be solved by one hasty agreement in just two days.

[Andreyev] And if nuclear weapons come to be in the hands of the presidents of independent states, how will the agreements signed earlier on their nonproliferation and reduction be implemented?

[Shevardnadze] This problem also has become more complicated. Who should ratify such agreements? The Supreme Soviet of the Union is essentially ceasing to function. What next? I believe we should discuss this thoroughly with Mr. Baker, as well as with our other foreign partners possessing nuclear weapons. The situation is entirely new, and new approaches to a solution are also needed.

[Andreyev] How do you see the role of the center in the current situation?

[Shevardnadze] The center is gradually disintegrating. I believe it is essential to examine very quickly the question of the creation of some coordinating body because the collapse of all central structures without the installation of a new coordinating principle will engender a mass of most serious problems.

[Andreyev] If there is no Union Foreign Ministry, what will you do?

[Shevardnadze] I have an excellent position—Interesting work in the association, in the Democratic Reform Movement....

[Andreyev] What is your attitude toward Gorbachev's statement concerning his possible resignation?

[Shevardnadze] Yes, Gorbachev does not rule this out, but I do not believe this will happen any day now. He is doing a great deal of work, and we are both of a mind to contribute to the process of creating a new commonwealth of republics. I believe he could still do much that is useful here. I advise Mikhail Sergeyevich to be in no hurry to make a decision on his resignation; there will always be time for this.

Yakovlev Debates Democratic Reform Impact

924B0168A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 51, 25 Dec 91 p 3

[Interview with Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev conducted by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA observer Aleksandr Borin; place and date not given: "Democracy, When It Is In a Hurry, Does Not Make a Moral Selection"]

[Text] [Borin] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, it seems to me that of late we have never experienced such disquiet as today, entering the new year of 1992. What are your thoughts, feelings, and concerns? What particularly oppresses you today?

[Yakovlev] We can only think seriously about the fate of the people and the country with a cool head. It is essential that passions and emotions subside and come back down to earth as far as possible. But today the situation is such that the time for cold reason has not arrived. Nonetheless, even in a state of a disturbed mind and disturbed feelings we can attempt to analyze this feeling—yes, you are right—of disquiet. What troubles me most? It is very often asked: Did we have a concept of perestroyka at all? Was there a clear outline? Such-and-such a stage should be followed by such-and-such; these goals will be short-term; these, more far-reaching. I believe that the very question comes from our habit of endless planning, which is essentially nothing more than self-deception. In setting ourselves some goals or other before did we really ever achieve them? No, of course not. It was perfectly obvious to me even then, in 1985, that all of our initial outlines—we must necessarily do such and such, unfailingly achieve this and that—would be oversimplified and unserious. Who, pray, could at that time have planned precisely how to emerge from such a deadlock, how to refashion the whole of society? And would such a plan have been accepted at that time? Imagine that we had begun to talk in 1985 about private farming. Or about free enterprise. Or about private property. Collapse of the entire reform! I say, therefore: Inasmuch as the path of evolutionary development, not revolutionary, was chosen; inasmuch as the intention was to make an attempt at a bloodless revolution—compromises with the times had, consequently, to be found constantly. Any evolution means a compromise with the times.

[Borin] How is that understood? With the state of society?

[Yakovlev] Yes, with the level of social consciousness, with the prevailing interests. Today you hear: The trouble is that the fate of the reforms was handed over to the party leadership. But, pray, could perestroyka have begun at that time, under those conditions, without the party? There was a dilemma: either complete transformations from above or rebellion. It was a question of this, this was the main contradiction.

[Borin] Possibly. But at that time the illusion that a revolution from the top would resolve everything was still alive. The prevailing notion was that something could be achieved by small means and transformations accomplished within the framework of the existing system. So-called socialism with a human face. But it proved to be a bluff, self-deception.

[Yakovlev] Right. But were someone now to say that already in 1985 or 1986 he saw the need for a cardinal social revolution, I would not believe him.

[Borin] Some people most likely did. A.D. Sakharov, for example.

[Yakovlev] Perhaps. But I am talking about active politicians who were at the helm of the country. The main illusion was that it seemed possible to reform the leading force of society—the party—and the entire system of power. It was here that the reformation ran into an obstacle each time. And only subsequently, about two years later, did there come to be a realization that the evolved system was not accepting reform, was rejecting it, and that the existing society was unreformable.

[Borin] When did this become clear to you personally?

[Yakovlev] Intuitively, long since, generally speaking. At the end of 1985 I sent a special memo on the need for the party to be divided in two.

[Borin] Sent to whom?

[Yakovlev] Well, to the top, let us say....

[Borin] The memo was rejected?

[Yakovlev] Yes, there was no response.

[Borin] What is meant by two parties? One communist, but the other?

[Yakovlev] No, I believed that both should have acquired new names.

[Borin] And how did they differ?

[Yakovlev] Well, how do you mean? In tactics of struggle. How does the Democratic Party differ from the Republican Party in the United States? In other words, a parliamentary mechanism of power was proposed.

[Borin] Only in tactics, or were there to have been different programs: One, say, proclaims private property; the other, on the contrary, rejects it?

[Yakovlev] You see, the logic of existence would, whatever, have compelled both parties to keep their ear to the ground. The ground in the sense of reality, life. An attentive ear. And then, with both feet resting on real ground, the parties would have competed with one another in the struggle for power and would have checked one another. The vast control machinery and much else also would have disappeared simultaneously. And there would have been fewer mistakes.

[Borin] Did you have allies in the leadership at that time?

[Yakovlev] Initially, no.

[Borin] And Gorbachev? Did he realize that the party was unreformable and a brake on everything, or did he hope to carry through the reform within the framework of the existing system?

[Yakovlev] Gorbachev is too complex a figure for anyone, including me, who knows him well, I believe, to say for certain what he is thinking at a given moment. Second, he is a person whose imagination—in the good sense of the word, of course—is working constantly, is constantly in action. And, third, he is a man of compromise. In that situation such compromise was essential—otherwise the conflicts would from the very outset have been far more brutal, and intolerance would have reached explosive force. But any compromise contains the possibility of mistakes: Some people have taken a step too far toward mutual accord, some have stopped half-way....

[Borin] Tell us, Aleksandr Nikolayevich, is the two-party system that you proposed better than the present boundless multi-party system? We are observing the flowering of full political pluralism, it seems.

[Yakovlev] Not the flowering, the deformity. If in the country there are, let us suppose, 200 parties, but far fewer social and professional groups and, all the more, fewer clearly expressed social interests, it is clear that many parties are focusing on one and the same social stratum. How do they differ from one another? I will tell you: in the degree of demagogy, the degree of populism. This one can express his idea in a more demagogic way—good man, we will elect him. And another says the same thing, but tediously, insipidly—let him wait. Although he could be a more serious and entirely practical person. What is happening is essentially a veritable parasitizing on people's interests and their fatigue and exhaustion. And people see and understand this full well. For this reason, they are looking today with great suspicion on politics, on parties and on their leaders. The two-party system would prevent such political parasitism, although not fully, of course.

[Borin] Addressing writers recently you said that the struggle against the old ways had not yet begun. It has not ended, I understand. But in what sense has it not begun?

[Yakovlev] Any definition is imprecise, arbitrary, if you will. How, you say, has this not begun? Nineteen eighty-five, the tumultuous processes which developed following the August putsch? All very true. But the main thing, I believe, has not occurred: The ideology of the new society has not yet emerged. Very well, we will not talk about ideology; we have a certain allergy to this word. But on what should the new society be built? Rationalism, common sense, pragmatism—in no particular way? No one will impose anything on the individual; if he wants, he works; if not, he does not. But he should know that he can no longer cling to the dependency rope and climb up it, he must make his actions conform to actual conditions and struggle to exist. I also am for social protection. But for whom? The sick? Yes. The person short-changed by nature? Yes. The child? Yes. The old man? Yes. But what kind of social protection does the healthy person need? Just one: to be given an opportunity for self-realization and not to be restricted in this self-realization if it is legitimate. This, strictly speaking, is the entire ideology of the new society. But has it not already taken shape? No. Nor could it have yet, most likely. Consequently, the new ideology does not exist as yet, and everyone's methods and habits with us remain as before. We have not conquered them. Consequently, we have not conquered ourselves. We have not overcome ourselves. And now—and this is what is most important—the revolution should take place in the besting of ourselves. But this has not happened. You look and see that same distributive-redistributive mentality....

[Borin] Among the democrats.

[Yakovlev] Among the democrats. That same prohibitive-legislature permissive mentality. That same Bolshevism. Raze to the ground, then.... A person worked in a district party committee? Away with everything, there's no place for you. But why? What if he is a good, competent specialist? Or even if he adheres to different views but does his job well? I am greatly troubled by this neo-Bolshevism. That same intolerance as before. I am very much afraid of them. I would like to hope that we will overcome, but.... Supposing the old structures of authoritarianism surface in some other form.

[Borin] Gamsakhurdia comes from dissident ranks. Kravchuk, on the contrary, is from the ranks of the old party functionaries, but does it not seem to you that identical political traits are manifested in them at times?

[Yakovlev] One has already given an account of himself; the other, not yet. But I do not want to bring up names. It is not just a question of them. It has to be said, regardless of names, that, in an ecstasy of power, some leaders in the republics have not yet caught on to the fact that they are figures of a transitional period and that others entirely are breathing down their necks. I personally am afraid of the possibility of the restoration in some places of feudal-communist structures—in spirit and in form. Of course, many very striking, interesting figures capable of getting things done have appeared among the democrats. But there are also, in my view, those who have not the slightest connection with democracy. Democracy is for them currently a convenience. But were tomorrow autocracy to set in, they would be no less and, perhaps, even more comfortable. Here's a pretty kettle of fish. This is the type of man we have raised: He feels fairly good under democracy, a little better under autocracy, but entirely well under dictatorship.

[Borin] But was this not, after all, how the present power structures were created? Although the elections were multiple-choice, there were among the candidates a huge number of apparatchiks, party, and trade union lists....

[Yakovlev] Yes, yes.... But imagine the following picture.... I am expressing my personal viewpoint here. The putsch wins. The putschists remain in power. They establish their own regime. A catch of democrats, who allegedly damaged society, is announced. Two or three rogues are found, the rest are thought up. And, what? How would many people locally behave? They would warmly welcome the victors, saying: "At last, thank God!"

[Borin] The name plates on the offices have been changed, but the people in them....

[Yakovlev] This is the core of the matter. The economy, policy, statehood, this procedure or the other—all are ultimately determined by man and his morality. In an immoral society, the economy is immoral also, everything is immoral. There emerged in 1985 the feeling that we had, seemingly, rejected the old morals of hatred, suspicion, and informing and had taken the first step toward civilization. But the result was what? The dark, most basal seams of the mentality spilled forth. So I continually wonder: Was it these loathsome traits which were being built up for 70 years?

[Borin] But let us return to the present day. Basal, dark seams spilled forth, consequently....

[Yakovlev] Yes, whole seams.... If you ask me: What, surely there is more conscience in society today? I would not assert this. Or surely there has come to be less hatred? No, not less, I do not think so. Whereas before some people concealed it from some careerist or, perhaps, selfish interests....

[Borin] From cowardice.

[Yakovlev] Yes, from cowardice; well, no one is concealing it now. In addition, they are even prancing, as it were, around this same hatred and showing consequently how bold they are and how consequently they have nailed another—and with a well-turned phrase, with necessarily mention of his name and frequently with a lie. This is what is happening.... And how bribery and corruption have flourished! One Western businessman told me recently: You have a great many offices, and there are a great number of bosses in them, and it is naive to think that business is completed until the official lower down the line, the office manager, has received a bribe. Bribes were taken earlier also, but they were at least concealed, and people were afraid. But today this is done entirely in the open for everyone to see. And why should we be surprised, come to that? A great deal of filth always sticks to great events. And this is what is very interesting: Democracy, when it is in a hurry, does not apparently make a moral selection. On the contrary, this very democracy is discredited, and precisely the ideals to which it aspires are compromised. Particularly when we consider the historical context of our society....

[Borin] Immoral?

[Yakovlev] Primarily lumpenized. It is on this generally that all our troubles and problems turn. We remain even today in a state of a particular mythology of power. As it was earlier, so it is now also. This, though, is very convenient, heaping all troubles and misfortunes on the authorities. All mistakes, all shortcomings. It is very good, you have dumped on them, and you are in an atmosphere of splendid psychological ease. Whoever so wishes, let him work, decide, be responsible, only not I. We say that we need the entrepreneur, we need a third estate. But what, essentially, does this mean? That we must all pass through the cauldron of struggle for our existence. That everyone be responsible for himself, for his family, not expect favors from the authorities. What do the authorities have? Nothing. They can only distribute. But distribute what? Only what has been made. But who will make it? It all boils down to this.

[Borin] It is distressing, Aleksandr Nikolayevich.... The seventh year of the new era, but it transpires that democracy is one thing; life, another. How could this have come about?

[Yakovlev] Among the many complex explanations, there is one simple one. The revolution occurred from the top. It could not at that time have been otherwise. But it should have been bolstered by revolution from below. But this did not happen. There was not even that enthusiasm which we saw in 1956, in Khrushchev's thaw. People sat on the fence. Why did it not happen? Because there emerged in the way of the transformations the party and state administrative system. And all who directly surrounded it, be they in scholarly, literary, or other circles. Together with it, the military and law enforcement apparatus. And, of course, the economic-management apparatus. And it was not only that all these forces and structures defended their positions and their vital interests—so be it, this was a minor matter. They did everything to prevent the awakening and shaping of particular interests in other social strata also. This is the heart of the matter. Tell me, did the peasant's real interests emerge? No. The worker's? Also no. But without clear, recognized, specific interests, what kind of revolution from below can there be?

[Borin] Lumpenization once again?

[Yakovlev] Yes, again.

[Borin] So what, then; defeat, consequently?

[Yakovlev] No, no! There can be no question of defeat. First, none of us acknowledges this. Second, there is no reason to acknowledge. Given any turning for which reactionary forces, which had been quiet, call today, it is no longer possible, it is impossible, returning people to the condition of the past. Granted all the shortcomings and flaws of society, it is no longer the same; there has been a qualitative change.

[Borin] I am listening to you and I think: Will some somewhat younger reader peruse our dialogue and think: What were these oldsters babbling about? How much expatiating can there be on morality? We are, after all, the retiring generation.

[Yakovlev] Yes, retiring. We will be followed by those who were born after the war, the death of Stalin coincided with their early childhood. I am excited when I view even a bad film about the Patriotic War; but they, no. You will say that the lies of Stalin's time made their mark on us. Yes, it is true. But what a mental drama we experienced in 1956! But those who will follow us? No, they are not dishonest, not thieves, not rogues. It is simply that there is much that has not affected them, not scratched them, not pressured them.

[Borin] But the disenchantment which replaced the hopes of 1956, the deadness of the Brezhnev times?

[Yakovlev] Yes, of course. Only disenchantment, deadness, and disbelief do not make a person better.

[Borin] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, you have never wanted to write a book about Gorbachev and about yourself? "My Gorbachev," so to speak?

[Yakovlev] It is too soon to speak about this now, I believe. A kind of historical cycle has not ended; some particular "i" has not been dotted. Regardless even of the personal fate of the individual. There are here, however, several intrinsic contradictions, which it would be difficult for me to resolve. First, I am firmly convinced that Gorbachev wanted good things for society and people. I know this for certain. And all the talk about the fact that he has been clinging or is clinging to power is rubbish, speculation. He possessed absolute power, but began voluntarily to renounce it. But a man's inner promptings do not always coincide with objective logic. Intentions are one thing, the result is another. Further, I cannot maintain that I have always and in all things been in agreement with Gorbachev. I wholly accepted and continue to accept his general line, but each person has his own view, his own approach, incorrect and subjective even, perhaps. I, for example, have always maintained that we should have started perestroyka with agriculture. I am told: The social consciousness was not ready for this. I do not know; in my understanding it was ready. Third, it is a personal thing. I know the president to such an extent that there is much—personal—that I cannot say out of ethical considerations. And, generally, I do not trust the people who bring up purely personal conversations for general discussion. This grates upon me even in memoirs. A person has confided in you, opened up his heart, and you broadcast it to the world. Of course, if my powers suffice, I will try to write something. But not reminiscences and not accusations against someone or other. God forbid; it will, rather, be an attempt to analyze and comprehend my times. I can say one thing: Gorbachev is a great and tragic figure. And the ingratitude toward him which many people are today somehow demonstratively in a hurry to express even....

[Borin] It also testifies to the immorality of our society?

[Yakovlev] Yes, yes. This wounds me deeply. This is why I am on his side.

[Borin] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, God grant that we will live and meet at the end of next year, 1992. What awaits us? What will we be talking about then?

[Yakovlev] A forecast? Well, everything is so uncertain today, and not many generatrices, as they say, are in sight, that making a forecast is extraordinarily difficult. Were it firmly known that the country would take the path of reforms, that a third estate, entrepreneurs, would be created, that agriculture would emerge on the path of private farming and initiative, and that culture would stand its ground in the face of commercialization, it could then be said that, yes, by the end of the year, somewhere around fall, improvements will evidently begin. But for this one needs to be confident that many essential factors will begin to work.

[Borin] And you are not confident?

[Yakovlev] And I am not confident. I do not have the sense yet that economic reform will be carried through to a conclusion. I am not confident that the resistance to private farming will be overcome locally and that the land will pass to the proprietor. I do not see as yet the forces which might ensure all this for certain. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet has declined to announce private ownership of the land. I am not confident that some maladroit, awkward, ill- considered, perhaps, actions of this ruler or the other in the center or locally will not lead to an overloading of the ship. And people now are angry. Are you convinced that under these conditions no one will take the path of provocation? Pluralism has now reached such an altitude that it is considered anti-democratic to tell a fascist that he is a fascist. It is being said that the empty store shelves are prompting fascism. This is untrue, it raised its head in this form or the other immediately following 1985, and some party leaders locally entered into direct contact with fascist groupings.... Nonetheless.... It is characteristic of people on the threshold of a new year to hope. Let us hope....

[Borin] For what? That our fears and apprehensions prove largely excessive?

[Yakovlev] Yes, I would like that very much. Let us hope.

Democratic Reform Movement Congress Viewed

924B0164C Moscow KULTURA in Russian
No 15, 21 Dec 91 p 3

[I. Zaramenskiy commentary: "'Faith Without Works Is Dead...'"]

[Text] For two days the Rossiya Concert Hall, which accommodated more than 1,500 delegates, observers, and guests of the constituent congress of the DRM [Democratic Reform Movement], effervesced with the life of our whole country. Representatives from the countries of the Baltic area to Russian Kamchatka and from Vorkuta to Tajikistan discussed heatedly, but seriously and in depth, problems which are truly pivotal in our history.

Whither they will take our fatherland only posterity will be able to evaluate objectively. It is not given to us to foresee the nature and details of the future. Do we need to? "Life is not a bureaucrat's piece of paper"—A.N. Yakovlev began his political report with these words. Truly profound reforms are still to come and are alive only in hopes. "A protracted ascertainment of the country in which we are living and in what kind of country we will be living continues as yet, unfortunately."

The problems of the transfer of the reforms to a practical channel and the political position in this connection of the DRM are the pivot around which the discussion turned, and it should be noted with satisfaction that, as distinct from other such meetings, it did not become diverted into squabbling and an elucidation of the question of "who is to blame?" The authorities came in for it considerably both in the reports and in the speeches, but the nature of the criticism was entirely different from what it was at the last CPSU congress, for example, or at plenums of its Central Committee. There was no malice, there were no demands for a turning back and mutual recrimination or condemnation.

At the same time full rein was given to constructive criticism of the actions of the new, democratic authorities sliding toward the traditions of the totalitarian past, being deflected from the consistent path of reform, resorting to illegality in the guise of "revolutionary expediency" or "national interests" and cultivating a new corrupt official-bureaucratic machinery suppressing society and man and devoid of any superior control.

The depth of the mistakes of the powers that be is such that the DRM is confronted in full measure with the question of a change of political position—of whether to become essentially a rights-defending, rights-asserting, rights-civilizing movement and switch to constructive opposition. These thoughts were heard most clearly in the political report and the supporting reports of A. Rutskoy, A. Sobchak, and G. Popov and in the speeches of a number of delegates.

There was a retaliatory response also: rebukes for undeserved criticism of B. Yeltsin and his government and the Supreme Soviet of the republic were expressed. The idea that a policy of opposition, even constructive, is a hostile intention, an obstacle to the work of the authorities and the "preparation of backup airfields" in the event of failure was tossed in. Now is not the time for criticism, it was said, it is necessary to "help" the authorities.

Truly, a rejection of criticism by the "town governors and Pompadours" and arguments against it have been customary for our society since the days of yore. This intolerance reached its high point in the times when any critic could be declared an "enemy of the people" and when any just citizen's demand of any state official was termed "anti-Soviet." The democratic authorities will end up the same way if from day one criticism is treated not as assistance but a hostile attack. "The democrats cannot be collectively responsible for the mistakes of government officials," G. Popov replied justifiably and with dignity to rebukes leveled at him for an "opposition attitude" toward the Russian Government.

As a result the resolution on the political question formulated the DRM's position as follows: constructive support for the democratic authorities—criticism of their steps which are inconsistent in the business of introduction of reforms—opposition to the authorities where totalitarianism is being revived and human rights are being violated.

At the center of the congress' attention were, of course, questions of the continued common habitation of the peoples and of the struggle for survival and the creation of a single economic and democratic space. Granted all the differences in views and in the approaches to the problem, the delegates supported the Minsk Commonwealth accords, viewing them as a long-awaited specific step toward concerted action. They are prepared to excuse the haste in its [as published] signing and the variant reading and some losses, just as long as the unchecked process of the disintegration of the economy, statehood and interethnic peace is stopped. Because in the wake of this the meaning of the reforms is being lost, democracy is coming apart and neototalitarianism of the worst, wildest model, for which human rights and life itself are nothing, is growing.

Participants in the movement from various republics actively supported the idea expressed in the program statement concerning independent, but joint actions in support of the democratic process since democracy, "like the multiplication table," is not a national concept. In the evocative words of the representative of an Azerbaijani organization, "it is impermissible painting it in national tones."

A condition of democracy is culture. Lack of culture ultimately defeated the October Revolution—thus, emotively and resoundingly, was the subject raised by M. Shatrov, the discussion on which assumed a profound nature. The humanitarian sphere is in no less need of reform than others. But it is this sphere which remains the least protected in the transition to the market. Culture, science, education, health care and physical culture create the environment which makes the individual the creative and inspired Man and shapes his future. No crisis justifies the disregard for the problems of culture which is being observed at the present time. In the opinion of many speakers, this is the worst of the vestiges which have come down to us from the past. At the same time, on the other hand, the question concerning the responsibility of the intelligentsia of all sovereign republics and states in the business of the furtherance of democratic transformations and its high creative, peacemaking mission was raised.

Many of the almost 200 speakers spoke of the DRM's place in the political spectrum, the organization of its work and its future. Judging by the practical proposals which were expressed and the hopes for the future, people trust the movement and would like to see it as an effective political force which is democratic and satisfies a wide range of interests. It is significant that at so contradictory a time not a single representative of a republic rebuked the movement on the nationality issue. Also noteworthy was the following fact—it was at the DRM congress that N. Travkin's party "ideology" deputy, A. Terekhov, went public with his statement of fundamental differences with the former in his views on democracy.

The DRM congress adopted a program statement and rules and elected a board. A. Volskiy, G. Popov, A. Sobchak, S. Shatalin, E. Shevardnadze, V. Shostakovskiy, and A. Yakovlev are cochairmen of the movement. Participants in the congress from Russia adopted a decision on the creation of a republic organization of the DRM and approved an organizing committee for its congress. Proposals concerning the organization of the movement's own newspaper and wishes for a strengthening of its work locally—the best evidence of people's faith and hope in the undertaking which has commenced—were heard.

Army, CPSU, KGB Coup Involvement Noted

PM3112144691 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 31 Dec 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by unidentified "our correspondent": "Findings Incomplete, Alas"]

[Text] The organizers of the SCSE [State Committee for the State of Emergency] allotted to Anatoliy Lukyanov a key role in the event of victory in the putsch, but he himself could not have been among the conspirators—that is the conclusion reached by the Commission To Investigate the Causes and Circumstances of the Coup d'Etat in the USSR. The commission members set forth their findings at a press conference in Moscow today.

On the basis of the documents analyzed by the parliamentarians, the active role of the USSR KGB and the Soviet Army in organizing and implementing the putsch, as well as the involvement of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat in the coup, are confirmed. Commission chairman Deputy Aleksandr Obolenskiy stressed that in the course of the commission's investigation of the putsch many of the documents of the top state structures which it requested were not made available to it, so that its findings cannot be complete.

Soyuz Deputy Calls Recent Events 'Coup'

LD2712184991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1620 GMT 27 Dec 91

[Text] Moscow, 27 Dec (TASS)—The "Soyuz" deputy group, uniting deputies of the former USSR Supreme Soviet with centrist views, has appraised events of recent days in the country as "a coup d'etat with the violent overthrow of the legally elected authority."

A statement received by TASS characterizes the decisions taken in Minsk and Alma-Ata as "a pact between newly arisen appanage princes [yudelnyy knyaz]." Mikhail Gorbachev is named "the main culprit for the catastrophe that has befallen the country." The document contains stinging accusations against the leaders of the former Union republics and their Supreme Soviets.

"In these days of most profound national tragedy and betrayal, we consider it necessary to warn the peoples of our country and the whole world community of the countless misfortunes that will be the inevitable consequence of the collapse of the USSR," it says in the statement signed by the coordinator of the "Soyuz" deputy group Viktor Alksnis.

'Only 20 or So' Protest Commonwealth, Leaders

LD3112100591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Dec 91

[Text] The mass-meeting of supporters of Nina Andreyeva's party; which was announced by the Kaliningrad local administration; did not take place. Only 20 or so people came to Lenin's Memorial Square to protest the Commonwealth of Independent States and its leaders' conference in Minsk. The protesters carried flags and banners of the former USSR. Passersby remained indifferent to the appeals of the meeting's organizers.

Bakatin Criticized for Cooperating With U.S.

924B0166A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 51, Dec 91

[Unattributed report under the rubric "For ARGUMENTY I FAKTY Readers Only": "The Hero of the United States of America"]

[Text] The openness of the Soviet society constructed by the father of perestroyka, M. Gorbachev, continues to strain our imagination. A few days ago the loyal confederate of the USSR president, KGB chief Bakatin, delivered to R. Strauss, U.S. ambassador to Moscow, a—figuratively speaking—blueprint of the types and locations of the listening devices in the American Embassy, as well as samples of the devices. According to some information received earlier by the editors, the entire new U.S. Embassy complex forms a sort of antenna, so the removal of "inserts" from its walls and floors is not going to dramatically resolve the issue of returning the anti-espionage virginity to the entire complex. Anyway, Bakatin probably has shared this information, too...

Is there any need to mention that the value of this Christmas gift is measured in billions of rubles and is a criminal squandering of national intellectual property.

This is not the only "strange" occurrence that had taken place at Lubyanka under Bakatin. In particular, 40 operational surveillance and records files on foreign residentura in Moscow have disappeared from his agency without a trace. There are reasons to believe that they have also "swum" across the ocean.

As is known, another M.S. confederate—Ye. Primakov—is "sitting" on intelligence. In analyzing certain information from various sources, there are reasons to believe that Yevgeniy Maksimovich also managed to familiarize himself with the dossiers on the major figures in Soviet intelligence abroad—something, it was pointed out to us, none of his predecessors had done for reason of security!

If Primakov decides to follow in Bakatin's footsteps, a long line of limousines with diplomatic plates will soon line up at the door of his office. Personal dossiers of "Schtirlitz's" and "Abel's" will be ceremoniously handed over to the new friends.

An internal investigation has already been conducted on the disappearance of 40 operational surveillance files. The incident has been qualified as betrayal and treason. Next is the investigation of Bakatin's transfer of materials on the American Embassy in Moscow.

Strategic Balance Viewed With Demise of Union

LD3112232591 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 30 Dec 91

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] The Soviet Union, or rather the totalitarian communist system that once kept 300 million people in harness and toyed with the maniacal idea of a world revolution, has ceased to exist. And that was, beyond doubt, the chief event that influenced international affairs. The Eurasian superpower with the nearly 4 million strong Army and the powerful nuclear arsenal, the power that other countries had to put up [as heard] and were even afraid of, despite its new policy known as the Gorbachev-Shevardnadze line, has quitted the political map of the world.

The question is what will now happen to the strategic balance that used to rest on Soviet-American partnership? True, the cooperation between the two countries largely determined positive changes on the international scene, including the ones that took place in the outgoing year. The defeat of the Iraqi aggression, the START treaty augmented by the proposals on eliminating tactical nuclear weapons, the gradual ebbing of tension at the world's hotbeds of tension, all this has been achieved largely thanks to cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Now that the Soviet Union no longer exists I began to wonder what if the other nuclear superpower will be tempted by the idea to rule the world. At any rate European and Asian countries are now thinking in earnest about the creation of a certain counterbalance. But while thinking about all that we should bear in mind one important consideration: No vacuum has been created in place of the former USSR. A Commonwealth of Independent States has appeared. Each member-state has become a full fledged subject of international law but the member countries will continue coordinating their foreign and military policy in one way or another. Besides, with the role of independent republics taken into account, Russia's position on the international scene should be singled out because of its enormous economic and manpower potential, its intention to preserve the nuclear potential for the purpose of keeping a military balance and the seat of a permanent Security Council member granted to it and once occupied by the Soviet Union.

In fact, Russia has become a legal successor to the USSR. The evidence of this is the rapid recognition by the international community of the new independent Russian state. It is Russia who will mainly be maintaining the strategic balance and the effort to build a new just world order. As the Russian leadership has declared: All positive things that have been gained by the Soviet Union in the last few years of its existence will be preserved and developed further. Boris Yeltsin has announced Moscow's intention to develop not simply businesslike but friendly relations with other countries.

Russia will order all the commitments, including the ones in the military field, the USSR once assumed. The nuclear push button, Boris Yeltsin said, has been handed to Russia and this country will do its best to never use it. Russia is going to pursue an open, peace-loving foreign policy and this is a guarantee of the safe future.

TASS Carries PRAVDA Review for 30 Dec

LD3012071491 Moscow TASS in English 0704 GMT 30 Dec 91

["PRAVDA Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow December 30 TASS—PRAVDA, the only Moscow-based newspaper that has come off the press on Monday [30 December], carries an interview with Belarus parliament chief Stanislav Shushkevich who on the eve of a meeting of the leaders of the members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) in Minsk expresses optimism as regards the future of the recently established CIS.

Shushkevich believes that a document determining a procedure for the reorganisation of the armed forces of the former Soviet Union is the principal one in a package of projects prepared for the Minsk meeting.

"I would be happy if we agree on two issues: a military one, which is being approached by no means from a unified position, and on a mechanism for the fulfillment of intergovernmental treaty obligations," Shushkevich said.

He pointed out an urgent need to reach agreement on an inflation level in the new Commonwealth.

A dispatch on the armed clashes in Tbilisi between the supporters of Georgia's President Zviad Gamsakhurdia and the advancing opposition conveys an opinion that "the president of Georgia will no longer have an occasion to congratulate his people on the new year."

PRAVDA frontpages a letter from a group of readers to Russia's President Boris Yeltsin. The letter reads as follows:

"The freeing of prices under conditions of state monopoly, an unprecedented corruption, fatal shortages, monstrous lawlessness, a virtual lack of power, and the absence of guarantees of social protection would produce a result opposite to the expected one and would lead to real hunger and social outbursts that would sweep away everything and would bring about complete destabilisation, with global death-carrying structures likely to get out of control."

A dispatch from Washington on prospects for relationships between the United States and the new Commonwealth specially points out:

"There are more questions than specific answers in a U.S. attitude towards our future and the future of our relations. One thing is clear: The United States is extremely interested in ensuring that the process of changes on the territory of the former Soviet Union evolve without complications and zigzags as far as possible and, most importantly, without the loss of a single control over if only part of the nuclear potential of the crumbled superpower."

An article analysing the problems of Yugoslavia says:

"The West has apparently made a mistake regarding a weakened communism as a more dangerous adversary than an excited nationalism. At present, looking at Yugoslavia, the West has realised its error but somewhat belatedly: Sparks from the flare-up of strife may scatter rather far away."

Press Review for 31 Dec

LD3112075591 Moscow TASS in English 0649 GMT 31 Dec 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow December 31 TASS—Newspapers report that the leaders of 11 members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) had a meeting in Minsk.

PRAVDA, commenting on the agenda of the talks in the capital of Belarus, writes that they marked the beginning of "a difficult quest for answers to ten questions." The scant information that seeped out of the closed-door talks indicates that discussions at the meeting were not easy.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA points out that the Army issue was the main subject of discussion at the CIS leaders' meeting in Minsk. They discussed problems that are of importance to the future of the Army, emphasises KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR). President Boris Yeltsin of Russia said the strategic armed forces would be under a single command subordinated to the Council of the Heads of State of CIS members.

All documents submitted to participants in the meeting for consideration were signed, Belarussian parliament chief Stanislav Shushkevich told a news conference at the close of the meeting. TRUD reports that the heads of state signed nine documents.

PRAVDA believes that the chief result of the CIS summit in Minsk is in the fact that it signifies a turning point in the history of the world's largest state—the USSR.

Newspapers run without comment excerpts from Russian President Boris Yeltsin's televised address on December 30, in which he summed up the results of the political and economic activities in the outgoing year.

Yeltsin believes that "a great positive result of the year is that the break-up of the Soviet Union has not led to the disunity of peoples. A Commonwealth of Independent States has emerged and may become even stronger than the USSR."

The president of Russia commented on some aspects of the economic reform which will be steadily carried into life so as to stabilise the economic situation by autumn and to work towards a gradual improvement of people's life by the end of next year."

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carries Yeltsin's televised address with a headline quoting him as saying that "Russia will begin to recover." RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper quotes Yeltsin as saying as "Russia will arise from its slumbers."

In this connection PRAVDA writes: "A way out of the crisis is possible resultant of a disastrous decline in the living standards of the population—this is what the present government of Russia thinks. But at the same it reassures society that such a shock therapy 'will not continue for long.'"

The newspaper cites the findings of a sociological forecast, made by the international forum "World Experience and the Soviet Economy," which are indicative of the opposite. The economic situation would deteriorate still further by the end of 1992, and would somewhat improve in 1993 and both substantial and minor changes are equally likely in 1995.

Newspapers continue to give prominence to reports from the country's flashpoints where a civil war is flaring up.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reports with concern that confrontation between the Georgian and Ossetian sides in South Ossetia continues. There is fighting in the streets of Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia. Tanks of Azerbaijan's army units have approached Stepanakert and shell the administrative centre of Nagorno-Karabakh.

Vadim Kozhinov, philosopher and publicist, has contributed an article to PRAVDA under the headline "Whither Mankind?"

The scholar addresses his article to powers-that-be, recommending them to draw lessons from the revolutions of the past, which ended as a rule with the restoration of old ways.

Analysing all Soviet "programmes for a transition to a market economy," the scholar points out that they are "fully based on an utter negation of everything that has been done in Russia since 1917." This is quite an understandable and natural aspiration, typical of the post-revolution eras, for "restoration" of old ways, he observes. But practical measures in this respect are both hopeless and very dangerous: They would lead only to chaos, economic dislocation and, quite possibly, to the heaviest sacrifices.

In SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, publicist Eduard Volodin reflects on the present and future. In an article headlined "Let Us Be Patient," he analyses the political practice of the democratic power in Russia.

Volodin believes that "the disintegration of the country in 1991" has become one of the outcomes of the activities of the new authorities. "In March, the people voted for an integrated power and in August it was eliminated with a stroke of the pen and with disregard for the will and opinion of the people," he writes.

In PRAVDA, Mikhail Tretyakov sets out his point of view on the development of events in the "former socialist countries of Eastern Europe where profound and rapid socio-political processes began."

In an article headlined "Dictatorship... Democracy... What Next?" he writes that "it has become clear that the essence of the transformations was not in refining socialism, as was being maintained, but in a U-turn in the development of society—back to capitalism. Democratic slogans are beginning to fade and the outlines of an indimidating bludgeon become increasingly manifest on the political canvas."

Press Review for 1 Jan

LD0101133192 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Press Review, second TASS take]

[Text] [no dateline as received]—The daily "RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA" carries an interview with a prominent economist Nikolay Shmelev, who comments on the forthcoming economic reform and liberalisation of prices to begin on January 2. Shmelev believes the measures proposed by the Russian government are necessary and inevitable, though they are not sufficient.

Yegor Gaydar and Boris Yeltsin are prepared for a painful economic operation using practically no anaesthetic. Besides, "the patient's hands are not tied up. What if he takes a knife and attacks the surgeon instead?", Shmelev asked. The plans of the Russian leadership can be roughly described in the following succession: liberalisation of prices, privatisation, and, late as it is, compensation to the people of what they have lost as a result of the first two steps.

Shmelev believes price liberalisation, privatisation and compensation should be carried out simultaneously. Otherwise we might be torn apart between the past and the future, he said.

The new Yeltsin decree on land privatisation, owned at present by the state and municipalities, gives more freedom to people wishing to provide food for themselves working at their own plots of land, the "KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA" writes.

The "SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA" daily carries a report by Eduard Limonov on his trip to Yugoslavia. The author blames the former Soviet president for the bloodshed in Yugoslavia. "Gorbachev let the Germans regain their power, he destroyed the Soviet might and, as a result, Croatian nationalists, backed by Germany, Austria, Hungary and Vatican decided to gain economic independemce", he claimed.

The newspaper "PRAVDA" carries an article summing up the results of the notorious anti-drinking campaign in the former Soviet Union. The newspaper said the campaign destroyed some 65-70 wine plants, thousands of hectares of vineyards, promoted moonshining, sugar deficit and endless queues. Such is the sad result of the thoughtless decision taken in May of 1985.

Commonwealth Affairs

Minsk News Conference Held 30 December

LD3112160791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1300 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Text] We now have an account of the news conference held by the Commonwealth heads of state in Minsk yesterday:

[Begin recording] [Shushkevich] I would like to draw your attention only to the fact that irrespective of how complicated the work on the documents was, all the documents have been adopted unanimously. The point is, that today 15 documents were adopted. Out of these, nine were adopted by heads of state and signed, while six were adopted by heads of government. That is why we had the kind of day we did. I will merely let you know about the names of the documents adopted by the heads of states: a provisional agreement on the Council of Heads of States and on the Council of Heads of Governments of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] an agreement between the CIS member states on the strategic forces; an agreement between the heads of the CIS member states on the Armed Forces and Border Troops; an agreement on joint activities in the exploration and use of space; an agreement between the heads of the CIS member states on the former USSR's property abroad; a protocol of the conference of the heads of independent states concerning preparation of a special agreement on the problems of the Aral and also on the problems of eliminating the consequences of the Spitak earthquake; a protocol of the conference, in a similar vein, concerning the preservation of the fish stocks in the Caspian Sea; a protocol of the conference of the heads of independent states concerning measures to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl nuclear power station disaster, to be implemented in 1992 and concerning the procedure for, and the size of their financing; and, ninth, a protocol of the conference of the CIS heads of states and governments concerning the setting up, name, structure, and the sources of financing of a working group to prepare organizationally and technically the holding of the council of the heads of states and of the council of the heads of governments of the Commonwealth.

We also approved a list of documents which must be elaborated quickly, and a whole number of related questions.

The fourth microphone, please go ahead.

[Terekhov] Terekhov, from INTERFAX. Please tell us what has been achieved, what sort of accord has been reached on the most important question, on the two most important questions: the military question and the question of coordination?

[Shushkevich] To whom is the question being put?

[Terekhov] Whomever will answer.

[Shushkevich] Whomever will answer.

[Terekhov] And a question for Boris Nikolayevich. Please tell us whether there have been any aspects, or questions which were completely, or partially unacceptable to Russia, causing you to compromise?

[Shushkevich] Boris Nikolayevich, both questions are yours.

[Yeltsin] I will start with the second one. It just does not happen that 11 heads of states and 11 heads of governments of the Commonwealth of absolutely independent states can get together and that they can sing literally the same tune, as has been the case for 74 years. There is no doubt that there were various views, but nonetheless, we arrived at certain compromises without impinging upon each state's position of principle and absolutely in keeping with the laws that exist in each state—that is the main thing. As for the military question: It was, perhaps, the most complex question for all of us. Nonetheless, we arrived at a decision that is acceptable to all the heads of states and heads of governments, and we signed it. In principle, the foremost, or in my view, the most important decision, or a part of this agreement, is that the strategic armed forces are under a single command, subordinated to the Council of the Heads of States. This is of fundamental importance.

The second question [as heard]. As for the conventional Armed Forces, we confirmed each state's right to resolve this in keeping with its laws; either to command the Armed Forces on its own or to hand them over under the command, the single command of the strategic Armed Forces. For the time being, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Moldova have stated that they will command conventional armed forces on their own. Everyone else agreed that their conventional armed forces will be under the single command.

[Zaribov] MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, special correspondent Zaribov. I have two questions. Leonid Makarovich, one of them may appear a bit harsh to you, but I will presently explain what dictates it. An impression is being created that Ukraine has, as it were, the absolute right to the final say. For instance, speaking at the airport today you called the ruble zone a fiction, that is, the existence of the ruble zone. Many journalists took note of that. Please explain this sort of harsh position. What is it dictated by? Is it caused, let us say, by a high level of national consciousness on the part of the parliament, or could it be the case that having refused to sign the charter, Ukraine regards itself for the time being as a temporary member of this Commonwealth? Please shed some light on this question.

[Kravchuk] Ukraine does not lay claims to having the final say, nor has that ever been the case. I mean, right from the very start, way back in the Belovezhskaya Pushcha, when we had the trilateral meeting, we agreed that it would be a Commonwealth of Independent States and that we would respect each other and respect the national laws. That is, if a state has adopted a package of laws at its Supreme Soviet sittings, the state, or its head, or the head of government cannot, upon signing this or that document of the Commonwealth, depart from the laws or the package of laws adopted by the parliament. This is the foremost issue and, in my view, the most fundamental one. That is why we lay no claims to having the final say. We are strictly fulfilling the laws adopted by the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. That is the first thing.

The second thing is this: I said today not that the ruble zone is a fiction, but that if states fail to receive an adequate supply of rubles, the ruble zone may turn into a fiction. That is, to all intents and purposes we will regard ourselves as being within the ruble zone, but we will have no rubles. Currently in Ukraine we have failed to pay 2.8 billion rubles to pensioners and teachers. This failure to pay is not due to a lack of willingness on our part, but to the fact that we have no rubles. It is this and this alone that may lead people to understand things in this way.

[Unidentified correspondent] A question to Mr. Nazarbayev. All in all, for how long are you going to think that...[changes thought] Will Kazakhstan be a nuclear-free power? The second question is to Mr. Yeltsin and Mr. Kravchuk. Will a single ruble zone nevertheless be created following these talks? What do you think, and if so, who will control the printing of money?

[Nazarbayev] Kazakhstan is a republic on whose territory nuclear arms are deployed. It was clearly stated in the Alma-Ata agreement between the four states on whose territory these arms are deployed, and I always express the republic's position with utmost clarity: Kazakhstan strives to be a nuclear-free zone. It takes part in all the processes to reduce the strategic nuclear offensive arms, and that is why it should participate in the process of negotiations on this issue, and the process of this destruction will also be taking place on the territory of Kazakhstan as it strives to be a nuclear-free republic. Currently, and in accordance with the quadrilateral agreement, control has been handed over to a single point: the commander in chief of the troops, whom we have confirmed, and the president of Russia.

[Kravchuk] Once more about the ruble zone. Ukraine is not renouncing the ruble zone. This is something I would like to emphasize right away. We understand Russia's difficulties because the printing machinery is currently in Russia, and it is, as far as I know, working around the clock. Is that not the case, Boris Nikolayevich, or something like that amount of time?

[Yeltsin] On a four-shift basis.

[Kravchuk] Yes, four shifts, right? And that is why, understanding Russia's difficulty—and I stress that we may object, or become indignant, but we do understand the difficulty—we are compelled, already in January, to pay out a part of the wages in reusable coupons, because we have no rubles.

[Yeltsin] I want to add that it is indeed the case that today all the states, heads of states and governments, confirmed that we will have a common ruble zone. It is the case that the supply of money must go up in keeping with the fact that as of 2 January there will be free prices, and we have already begun to issue 200 and 500 ruble notes, and 1000 ruble notes will appear by the end of January. It is our view that our duty is to ensure assistance to republics so that there are indeed no difficulties in providing notes.

[Unidentified correspondent] Information that there was a debate on the possibility of setting up a Commonwealth television and radio company has leaked to the foyer. If that is the case, where will the television and radio company be situated—Moscow or Minsk? The second question concerns the setting up of a Commonwealth publication. If this question has been debated, what decisions, even if preliminary, have been adopted?

[Yeltsin] We discussed this question today taking account of the fact that the Union is no more; it has disintegrated. Nor are there any Union structures, and we noted this, too, in our first agreement today. Consequently, the television company cannot be suspended in mid-air. Because, or taking account of the fact that it is situated on the territory of Russia, it has, by a presidential decree, been taken under Russia's jurisdiction, together with what it owns, its property. We agreed today, however, that the first television channel is given over only to the Commonwealth countries; the second channel is the Russian one; the third channel is the Moscow one, and the fourth channel is an educational one, on the questions of market economy.

[Shushkevich] I would just add that Ostankino is not going to be moved to Minsk; let Muscovites rest easy.

[Unidentified correspondent] Information magazine PRIVATIZATSIYA OT YA DO MY. I have a question for Stanislav Stanislavovich and Boris Nikolayevich. The existing laws, as well as the provisional privatization procedure, adopted by the Belarus Council of Ministers has, in practice, created conditions for the selling off of the sovereignty of the Republic of Belarus, pardon the harshness. In this context, here is a question for the presidents of the biggest states of the Commonwealth: Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan. Have plans to privatize state property been agreed among the Commonwealth countries, or does it remain a prerogative of each individual state? Please clarify, if possible, thank you.

[Shushkevich] Boris Nikolayevich, please go ahead.

[Yeltsin] We have agreed on the main principles of the reform; its pace, deadlines, and main aspects of the reform, the fundamental ones. However, it is the laws of each independent state that decide what each issue will be like inside—its meat and bones, its content—and this goes for the issue of privatization, too.

[Kravchuk] I would like to add one aspect here. It is our third meeting and all the time, constantly, we focus attention on the fact that it is a Commonwealth of Independent States. No decisions that impinge on a state's domestic or foreign policy are made. I would like journalists to understand that we are talking of independent states here and that no common decisions affecting policies will be made.

[Shushkevich] In this context I, too, would like to say that sovereignty is not a bargaining counter. If we have adopted any acts under the law which are not to someone's liking, it is, all in all, our internal matter which we must rectify and no one will teach us to act sensibly if we fail to learn to do this ourselves. Hence, within the framework of our independence, we will tackle these questions completely independently. As for consultations, exchange of experience, exchange of information on this issue and, generally, the general difficulties that are being experienced, these can be of mutual use.

[Nazarbayev] Kazakhstan has its own privatization program. The privatization problem must take account of the specific features of each region, its situation, national traditions, and distinguishing features and that is why identical privatization and dismantling of state controls can not exist, all the more so because it is a sovereign state. However, it has been and it is my view that the coordination of our activities in entering the market economy in this crisis situation would be useful for all states and, above all, for the people. If today, however, we have not even been able to set up a 20-man coordinating body, a secretariat which would somehow gather us all together, you will understand that our desire to move from the 74 years of totalitarianism, accustomed to vertical rule—we are creating vertical rule within the republics, but it is a very uphill task where the Commonwealth is concerned—so how can one even talk about some kind of unified approach toward privatization.

[Shashkov] Aleksandr Shashkov, Russian Television. Boris Nikolayevich, due to a lengthy period of the absence of information, there has been a rumor that Marshal Shaposhnikov submitted a letter of resignation to you. Is this true? If so, what caused it? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] Our consensus with regard to the Armed Forces did not come easy today. Marshal Shaposhnikov did not agree with some questions. Nonetheless, we found common consensus—not just heads of states and heads of governments, but also Marshal Shaposhnikov. After that, all questions were removed. One more piece of information: Let me tell you that Colonel General Kalinichenko was today appointed commander in chief of the Border Troops. He has been instructed to conclude relevant agreements with all the states to defend the state borders within two months.

[Unidentified correspondent] The Belarus Telegraph Agency—Stanislav Stanislavovich, can one ask you to make a brief New Year's toast? It so happens that your conference, our conference is taking place on the eve of the new year. So, let us have your wishes for the population of all the 11 Commonwealth member states.

[Shushkevich] I would like to say that on New Year's Eve I am ready to raise a toast to the Commonwealth, which has certainly put an end to the hypocrisy which for us has been part and parcel for many years. It has ended and you can drink to that.

[Unidentified correspondent] All the best for the New Year, thank you. [end recording]

[Announcer] God willing, this Commonwealth will pave the way for us toward the future. We have broadcast an account of the news conference held in Minsk yesterday, following the conference of the heads of governments.

Shushkevich Summary

LD0101102492 Moscow TASS in English 0926 GMT 1 Jan 92

[By BELTA correspondent Vladimir Glod]

[Text] Minsk January 1 TASS—Though heads of the new Commonwealth member states differ on problems discussed at their latest meeting in Minsk, they all wanted to reach a reasonable compromise, Belarus leader Stanislav Shushkevich told reporters late on Tuesday [31 December].

No central Commonwealth bodies were created in Minsk but Shushkevich believes certain coordinating bodies are necessary. The first to appear may be the Commonwealth foreign ministry, he hinted.

Yet Shushkevich said attempts to revive the old centre may ruin the new commonwealth. "The ideas of certain people to revive old central structures may push some of the states away from the Commonwealth", he added.

But the Belarussian leader stated all opinions are taken into account in the new Commonwealth. "If (former Soviet) President (Mikhail) Gorbachev at the State Council meetings could leave unnoticed an opinion he did not like, in Minsk everyone was attentively listened to", he explained.

Heads of the Commonwealth member-states will meet again in a month or two to discuss military, border and other problems. There are over 40 priority issues to be settled by the new Commonwealth leaders, Shushkevich said, adding that the next meeting may again take place in Minsk.

The Belarussian leader believes new states can join the Commonwealth in the near future. "The agenda of the coming meetings may grow as applications to join the new Commonwealth will have to be discussed", he said

Stankevich Sees Future Role for Gorbachev

PM0201110992 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Dec 91 First Edition p 3

[Untitled TASS report under the "Pulse of the Planet" rubric]

[Text] Tokyo, 30 Dec—Sergey Stankevich, state counselor to the Russian president, has stated that the post of general secretary might be created in the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] for which, in his opinion, former USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev would be most suitable. In an interview with the Japanese TOKYO SHIMBUN newspaper Stankevich noted that the general secretary should conduct CIS sessions and represent it abroad.

Member States Agree on Accords, Protocols

Scientific, Industrial Cooperation

LD2712152291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1421 GMT 27 Dec 91

[By BELTA-TASS correspondent Dmitriy Patyko]

[Text] Minsk, 27 Dec (TASS)—An interstate meeting of government delegations and experts of Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] independent member states at the "Zaslavl" residence ended with the signing of an accord on interstate scientific and technical cooperation and a provisional accord on protecting industrial property. The documents were signed by representatives of Armenia, Belarus, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, and Ukraine. The other commonwealth members intend to join the accords later.

Participants in the meeting noted in a conversation with the BELTA correspondent that the signed documents make it possible to preserve single intellectual space and will promote the preservation of the commonwealth states' scientific potential.

Within one or two years a convention on protecting intellectual and industrial property will be developed, whereas the provisional accord is coming into force for the time being; it will open for the commonwealth states the potential of Russia's patenting services and possibilities for developing such structures at home. Economic levers and ways of stimulating invention activity may differ among the commonwealth states but the legal basis of the convention will be the same.

Foreign Ministers To Confer

PM0201124192 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Jan 92 First Edition p 2

["Protocol of Conference of Heads of States and Governments of Commonwealth of Independent States"]

[Text] The foreign ministers of the Commonwealth states are to be instructed to submit for the examination of the Commonwealth heads of state proposals on the title, structure, and sources of finance of the working group for the organizational-technical preparation and holding of the council of heads of states and the council of heads of governments of the Commonwealth.

A foreign ministers conference on this question shall be held no later than 10 January 1992 in the city of Minsk.

For the Azerbaijan Republic, A. Mutalibov
For the Republic of Armenia, L. Ter-Petrosyan
For the Republic of Belarus, S. Shushkevich
For the Republic of Kazakhstan, N. Nazarbayev
For the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, A. Akayev
For the Republic of Moldova, M. Snegur
For the Russian Federation, B. Yeltsin
For the Republic of Tajikistan, R. Nabiyev
For Turkmenia, S. Niyazov
For the Republic of Uzbekistan, I. Karimov
For the Ukraine, L. Kravchuk.

Fish Stock Protection

PM0201124792 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Jan 92 First Edition p 2

["Protocol of Conference of Heads of Independent States"]

[Text] The governments of the Azerbaijan Republic, the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, and Turkmenia are preparing a special agreement on preserving the fishery resources of the Caspian Sea.

It was done in the city of Minsk on 30 December 1991 in a single copy in Russian. The original shall be given for safekeeping to the Belarus Government, which shall send the states signatories to the present protocol a certified copy.

For the Azerbaijan Republic, A. Mutalibov,
For the Republic of Armenia, L. Ter-Petrosyan,
For the Republic of Belarus, S. Shushkevich,
For the Republic of Kazakhstan, N. Nazarbayev,
For the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, A. Akayev,
For the Republic of Moldova, M. Snegur,
For the Russian Federation, B. Yeltsin,
For the Republic of Tajikistan, R. Nabiyev,
For Turkmenistan, S. Niyazov,
For the Republic of Uzbekistan, I. Karimov,
For Ukraine, L. Kravchuk.

'Precise Agreement on All Questions' Reported

PM0201122992 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jan 92 p 1

[Report by correspondents Adylbek Kaipbergenov, Oleg Stepanenko, and Aleksandr Ulitenok: "Meeting in Minsk Ended"]

[Excerpts] Minsk—The news conference of the heads of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] states began late in the evening, when the protracted talks had disrupted the previously compiled schedule. Journalists were, however, wrong in supposing that the heated discussion which had proceeded throughout a tense day would be continued in the conference hall, where over 300 correspondents from all over the world had gathered. In contrast to the previous meeting in Alma-Ata, when the "explanation of relations" between the leaders of the "11" continued to the end, as the saying goes, here in Minsk S. Shushkevich, B. Yeltsin, L. Kravchuk, N. Nazarbayev, and their colleagues reached the "finishing straight" with a precise agreement on all questions under discussion. [passage omitted]

S. Shushkevich noted that it is far simpler to destroy yesterday's structures than to create new ones.

The complexity of the problem can also be seen clearly in the example of the "11's" discussion of a question such as the military one. B. Yeltsin admitted that the question was so acute that Marshal Ye. Shaposhnikov was on the point of announcing his resignation. [passage omitted]

And so henceforth the united command of the strategic, border, and conventional armed forces has been subordinated to the Council of Heads of State. And one more innovation from the military building field: A council of defense ministers of all CIS states has been created and is to elaborate a common defense policy. A specially appointed representative will join the council from those republics where there are no such ministries. In Minsk the right of each independent state to have conventional armed forces subordinate only to itself was confirmed. [passage omitted]

The Ukrainian president was asked what had caused his republic's special, even tough, stance on individual very important problems of the Commonwealth.

"Ukraine does not lay claim and never has laid claim to the last word. Even in Belovezhskaya Forest at the very start we agreed that it would be a Commonwealth of Independent States and we would respect each other and respect each state's national legislation." [passage omitted]

Alma-Ata Nuclear Arms Agreements Viewed

PM3112142191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 91 Union Edition p 6

[Article by V. Mikheyev: "Nuclear Button... Human Rights... Market Forces; Questions To Which World Expects Answers From Commonwealth"]

[Text] It was hard to expect that the "special positions" of the members of the Commonwealth which has been announced would immediately be reduced to a common denominator and that some middle ground—leveling and conciliating—would be introduced. The experience of the EC, if one recognizes the correctness of a direct analogy, shows that it takes years, if not decades, for that.

Does that justify the fact that the Alma-Ata agreements contain yawning gaps? Most likely, yes, but outside states, which are making every effort to paint a picture of "cautious optimism," are not ceasing to ask direct questions to which Alma-Ata has not given an answer.

Without collusion the German and Japanese foreign ministers set two essential conditions for diplomatic recognition of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States]: respect and observance of the international commitments of the former USSR, especially in the field of disarmament, and full clarification of the problem of control over the 27,000 nuclear warheads.

Indeed, a bold compromise was required to determine the fate of the "nuclear button." It is well known that Kiev insisted that all four republics with nuclear systems in their territory (Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan) should have the right of veto. A procedure was even proposed for making a collective decision, something like a duplicate "dual key." It is well known that Alma-Ata—in contrast to Kiev and Minsk, which stated their intention to become nonnuclear states in the future—wanted to retain its "share" of nuclear strategic arms.

The decision to transfer by July 1992 all tactical nuclear weapons in Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine to the control of the central organs, where they will be subject to destruction under unified control, was a triumph of common sense over localistic ambitions. Only Russia will have nuclear deterrent forces. Thus instead of four nuclear buttons there will be just one.

Nonetheless, not everything was determined in the field of military policy. Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, temporarily appointed commander in chief, is a supporter of a unified management of the strategic forces and a professional army. Here the republics form their own national guards with a numerical strength of up to 3,000. How does this model comply with Ukraine's intention to have its own armed forces or Azerbaijan's decision to place the Caspian flotilla under its jurisdiction?

Will it be possible to say in the very near future that the Commonwealth will follow or adhere to a single foreign and defense policy? The application for NATO membership made by the Russian leadership last Friday is shadow-boxing with the Ukrainian parliament's declaration, which rejects any participation in any military bloc.

Soon the "locked border" concept may become an abstract one. Counter to the intention of the participants in the Alma-Ata forum jointly "to protect the borders of their possessions against attacks," Ukraine stated unambiguously that it was not taking part in it. Next REUTER asks what will happen if the state border of the former USSR is divided into sectors of responsibility and itself answers: "If Russia decides to protect only its own borders, then the borders of the Central Asian republics, which depend to a considerable degree on the presence of Russian soldiers, will remain virtually undefended."

The at first glance trivial problem of the division of the diplomatic legacy also hangs like the sword of Damocles. Not all the republics welcomed with enthusiasm the transfer to Russian jurisdiction of Soviet embassies, consulates, and trade missions. The controversial approach toward citizenship can also be called a time bomb: It is understandable that a free assembly of independent states cannot have a common citizenship, but how will the fate of the national minorities which in some republics are called "immigrants" or "occupiers" be resolved? What awaits the 25 million Russians now living in the territory of other republics?

Will the market forces which will make themselves felt fully in Russia after the release of prices announced for 2 January but which are still muted in the republics less prepared psychologically for this step not undermine the fragile agreement reached in Alma-Ata? According to a statement from Uzbekistan President Islam Karimov, prices must be released only when "the weak elements in society" are reliably protected.

On his return to Moscow Russian President Boris Yeltsin gave an assurance that the ruble will remain the only unit of accounting between the republics. Yet Ukraine and Belarus intend to introduce their own currencies or coupons, which introduces additional uncertainty to the normal functioning of the "single economic area."

The questions remain. In Alma-Ata a step was taken in the correct direction, but it is only the first step. It is important not to retreat at the second step.

Scientific

Subterranean Nuclear Power Stations Planned

Research Director Interviewed

OW2112034991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1804 GMT 20 Dec 91

[Interview with Nikolai Melnikov, director of the Mountain Institute of the Kola Research Centre and USSR Academy of Sciences' associate member, by Vladimir Belov; from "Nation and Society"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Nikolay Melnikov [N.M]: Our institute is this country's chief research institution in subterranean construction and it has long been working on defense projects. After the Chernobyl disaster, a Soviet governmental commission, on recommendations from Academician Anatoliy Aleksandrov, charged us with a project titled "Subterranean Nuclear Stations: An Analysis of Safety, Conservation, and the Feasibility of Projects." We reported the results of the work to the Council of Ministers in 1989, and last year the report formed the basis for the state program "Underground Nuclear Power Plants," which is the result of an extensive body of research. We simulate any emergency situations and their consequences, including the ecological aspects. This is part 1 of the program. Part 2 consists of several concrete projects, including the construction, prior to the year 2000, of several medium-power stations. They will be located underground, which will make it possible to guarantee a high level of environmental protection in any disaster.

Our idea has pluses and minuses. We do not assert that this is the only way to develop nuclear power, but this is a sensible alternative, pending the time when truly safe nuclear reactors will come into being that will be designed to handle any accidents.

Corr. [Correspondent]: Where do you plan to locate the plants?

N.M : One, with a capacity of up to 800 megawatt, may be located in Murmansk region. A 500 megawatt station could be built in Central Siberia. St. Petersburg and Vladivostok have also proposed locations. This year we visited Kazakhstan at the invitation of the republican Cabinet of Ministers and Academy of Sciences. Kazakhstan proposed five locations: Semipalatinsk, Ust-Kamenogorsk, Chikent, Balkhash and Alma-Ata. To be sure, Kazakhstan is a very difficult place, but then, the republic needs nuclear energy since the region's environment suffers from heating stations that use boiler fuel.

Corr.: The year 2000 is close at hand. At which stage is the program now?

N.M.: We have already broken the ground on the first projects already now we can build underground facilities up to 90 metres high, and 30 to 40 metres wide.

Ground waters pose a serious problem, as well as fissures and other surprises. We plan to select a location that meets all the requirement, water, seismic qualities etc.

Corr.: But these projects are close to big cities too, (same as Chernobyl). Isn't it dangerous?

N.M.: Regrettably, a water-heating station just must be close to the city to be able to get heated water to the consumer, in contrast to an electric station. The main thing is to find a suitable place in terms of geology.

Corr.: What are the advantages of subterranean location in case of a disaster?

N.M.: A station has outlets to the surface, transportation, ventilation and communication shafts. We can seal them off in less than half a second.

In case of a severe disaster, with a meltdown of the core and the failure of all emergency electric supply systems and a blowout of radiation, we have counter measures for all the scenarios, in contrast to a surface station. A surface station cannot cope with a category 7 disaster, i.e, a total catastrophe, in conformity with the IAEA classification. We have. Our project provides for special shafts to drop the radioactive mixture into. For all practical purposes, this is a new level of environmental safety.

Corr.: Do I take you right that your safety techniques are not related to equipment?

N.M.: Right. We do not improve the safety of the equipment. We take standard equipment and create conditions making it safe for the environment.

Station Planned for Far East

LD2712183191 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 27 Dec 91

[By TASS correspondent Leonid Vinogradov]

[Text] Vladivostok December 27 TASS—An underground nuclear power station is to be built in Maritime territory, the Soviet Far East. This was decided by the territorial minor council.

Leningrad specialists are ready to build the project. They believe one year is enough to prepare the pit for the power station. All the maintenance crew will work on the surface, while the power plant, resembling installations used on submarines, will be assembled deep underground.

The possibility is also being explored to build the power plant in some used up coal or ore mine.

Further on Maritime Kray Plant

LD3012120191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0130 GMT 30 Dec 91

[Text] The decision to construct an underground nuclear electric power station [AES] has been adopted at a session of the Maritime Kray's smaller council. It will be built at a depth of 60-100 mm and will use four atomic reactors, which usually are mounted on atomic submarines. The station is rated for 40 years of operation. The estimated level of safety is 1,000 times higher than that of an ordinary surface AES. Feasibility studies are expected to be completed in 1992. The Academician Krylov Central Research Institute, the staff of the Metrostroy, and a number of other St. Petersburg enterprises are to take part in developing designs and in construction.

Scientists Begin 'Apex' Space Project

LD0101181392 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1900 GMT 28 Dec 91

[By TASS observer Vladimir Khrustov]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Dec (TASS)—Scientists and specialists of the Inter-Cosmos program member countries have begun implementating the Apex (Active Plasma Experiments) international scientific project. A subsatellite, Magion-3, was separated today from the main satellite, Intersputnik-25, which was launched on 18 December.

Professor Viktor Orayevskiy, director of the Russian Academy's Institute of Earth Magnetism, the Ionosphere, and Radiowave Propagation, told the TASS observer in an interview that the Apex project is a new generation project to use beams of electrons and ions to investigate the mechanism of links between the sun and earth, as well as ionospheric and magnetospheric processes.

There are provisions for carrying out experiments to investigate the antenna properties of beams of electrons and ions (this being dependent on the position of the satellite in near-earth space), and also the electrodynamic characteristics of near-earth space. The use of beams of charged particles as antennas gives enormous advantages: they are structure-free antennas and do not require the deployment of metal structures in space.

It is important to note that the research into near-earth space by means of electrons and ions carried out earlier from orbiting space systems, in particular the shuttle, covered a fairly narrow area: up to 400 km in altitude and approximately plus or minus 50 degrees from the equator. In the Apex experiment the boundaries of the area being investigated are much wider: 3,000 km at the pole and about 50,000 km at the equator.

The equipment on the spacecraft was created by scientists and specialists of Russia and Ukraine, as well as Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Poland, Germany, Hungary, and Romania.

'Magion-3' Separates

LD2912225691 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT 29 Dec 91

[Text] Moscow December 29 TASS—On December 28 1991, the Czechoslovak satellite "Magion-3" was separated from "Interkosmos-25" artificial earth satellite launched on December 18, 1991. "Magion-3" satellite carries equipment made in Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and Germany. "Magion-3" satellite has a "Pursar" engine for multiple corrections of its orbit in accordance with the flight programme.

The implementation of a comprehensive scientific programme with the use of two spacecraft and a network of geophysical observatories in various countries begins after "Magion-3" satellite separates. Interaction of electron currents with beams of plasma and the earth's ionosphere and magnetosphere will be studied by means of equipment on board the satellite. There will also be observations from the ground.

The parameters of "Magion-3" satellite are similar to those of "Interkosmos-25".

Onboard systems and scientific equipment is functioning normally. The incoming information is being processed.

Military

Troop Withdrawal From Germany on Schedule

LD3012210291 Moscow TASS in English 1955 GMT 30 Dec 91

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Voronenkov]

[Text] Berlin December 30 TASS—The withdrawal of the Western Group of Forces will be completed by the end of 1994, in accordance with the treaty on conditions of temporary stay and planned withdrawal of Soviet troops from German territory, says a report of the Western Group of Forces' press center circulated here today.

The report says the plan of troops withdrawal in 1991 has been fully completed. Almost 165,000 men, including over 110,000 servicemen, and more than 35,000 units of materiel and armaments have been withdrawn from Germany.

Formations of the Western Group of Forces have been fully withdrawn from 58 garrisons, including capitals of west German lands - Magdeburg and Erfurt.

Another 30 per cent of personnel, materiel, armaments and material means will be withdrawn in 1992. As a result, 158 military settlements and facilities will be passed over to the German side.

The troops withdrawal is being done in close interaction with the federal and land power bodies and the German Army Command.

Division of Fleet Considered 'Difficult'

LD3112212291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 31 Dec 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] One of the basic questions for the future Commonwealth is whether the Armed Forces will remain united and who will have his finger on the nuclear button. Marshal Shaposhnikov, who threatened to resign if the Army became fragmented, has not resigned so far. It is still unclear whether it will prove possible to find a compromise and a lasting solution. Our correspondent reports on the situation in the Black Sea Fleet.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent V.Plotnikov] The sons of 70 peoples of the former Soviet Union serve in the Black Sea. Interethnic—and, it must be said, very friendly—crews are the norm here. Will this tradition really be damaged? And what will happen to the glorious history of the fleet? How can the fleet be divided up?

[Admiral I.V. Kasatonov] Well, having experience of service and experience of life, I would say that dividing the fleet is an extremely difficult and, probably, excessive task. How is it to be accomplished without harming anyone? To simply order the fleet, as it were—so to speak—to accomplish it is not scientific, and is not based on economic laws nor the laws of history. It is, of course, impermissible and, in general, wrong. It will detract from its combat capacity. There is no doubt about that.

[Plotnikov] Thank you. [end recording]

Concept of Joint Armed Forces Assessed

PM3112142791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Dec 91 Union Edition p 3

[Report by military observer V. Litovkin including comments by Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of Commonwealth Armed Forces, and Georgiy Zhivitsa, Ukrainian Armed Forces chief of Main Staff: "Army Is Prepared To Obey Presidents. Presidents Are Trying To Agree Among Themselves"]

[Text] As already reported in IZVESTIYA (No. 306), on the eve of the Minsk meeting of the heads of the independent states of the Commonwealth, a conference of the defense ministers and chairmen of the committees for defense questions of these states was held in Moscow under the leadership of Marshal of Aviation Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the Commonwealth Armed Forces. The military men agreed their proposals regarding the organization of the future Commonwealth Armed Forces.

What did they manage to reach agreement on?

At a small press conference held immediately after the end of the meeting for a narrow circle of journalists, Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov said that it was possible to finish work on the drafts of four main documents: agreements among the states on defense questions during the transitional period, on the status of the Commonwealth Joint [Obyedinenyy] Armed Forces on their territories, and on the military oath and a provisional statute on a coordinating organ—a Commonwealth Council of Defense Ministers (Chairmen of Defense Committees). Despite some disagreements on certain questions, all the participants in the meeting signed these documents, and they will be submitted to the presidents so decisions can be adopted.

From the concept of unified Armed Forces, Shaposhnikov said, we have arrived at the concept of joint Armed Forces.

What is this all about? About the fact that two levels of army formations are being created. Joint Armed Forces, which are to include Strategic Forces (large strategic formations, combined units, units, institutions, strategic and operational intelligence facilities, Strategic Rocket Forces, Air Forces and Naval Forces, Air Defense Forces and Airborne Troops, the Directorate of the Chief of Space Forces, nuclear-technical and other systems designed to protect and support the operations of strategic forces), General-Purpose Joint Forces (large strategic formations, combined units, units, institutions, and facilities on the territory of the Commonwealth member states and not forming part of the Strategic Forces or the independent states' armed forces), and also the independent states' armed forces themselves.

But even with this option, the Commonwealth commander in chief said, not everyone is suited by the concept of Joint Armed Forces. Ukraine, Moldova, and Azerbaijan hew to the position of creating their own armed forces. And this question will be finally resolved in Minsk.

The appearance of Moldavian and Azerbaijani national armies, small though they might be, given the instability in the Dnestr and Gagauz regions and against the background of the continuing war in Nagorno-Karabakh, prompts many questions, although the aims and tasks of these armies are self-evident.

But it is not all that easy to answer the question: Why does Ukraine need a powerful, well armed army? Is this step explained merely by a desire for total independence and by the safeguarding of sovereignty? After all, the forces that the republic intends to acquire greatly exceed its requirement for defense.

Ukraine, Georgiy Zhivitsa, chief of Main Staff of the Ukrainian Armed Forces, told your IZVESTIYA correspondent, is laying claim to all the units and combined units and all the equipment and weapons of the three military districts situated on its territory, including the Strategic Rocket Forces and long-range aviation units, and the entire Black Sea Fleet, which, as is well known, includes no strategic units or ships.

Experts believe that the Armed Forces situated in Ukraine total around 470,000 men. Even if it proves possible to divide them in half, as the delegation of the Commonwealth Armed Forces High Command [Glavkomat] headed by Colonel General B. Pyankov currently in Kiev is seeking, even then an army of 250,000 men plus the Black Sea Fleet with 65 large surface ships and 21 submarines immediately make its armed forces among the most powerful in Europe, comparable with France, Britain, and Germany.

Why does Ukraine need such military might? Who is it intending to fight if around it there is no state that represents a military threat to it? Experts believe: Naturally, no one poses a threat and Ukraine has no intention of fighting anyone. Moreover, the republic will simply be unable to "handle" the powerful army that will be left once it has been divided in the republic. That army requires not only great financial expenditure—around 50-70 billion rubles each year in current prices—but also sizable material resources, including fuel resources. Ukraine is very poor in those.

But not all this will be required. The same specialists are convinced that Ukraine will not maintain such a large army and fleet. It may sell all the superfluous weapons and combat equipment, including that which is to be reduced under the Vienna agreement, on the world market. Soviet military equipment—whatever may be said about it—is comparatively cheap, simple, and quite effective. So it is in great demand, especially in "Third World" countries. And the hard currency obtained for it—millions of dollars—could help the republic resolve its national economic problems.

The appearance of such a mighty weapons exporter worries and concerns many people in the world today. This prospect also concerns Russia's leadership, and the "disappearance" of Ukraine and its army from the common military-strategic area may entail serious defense problems.

Over the last 70 years, Marshal of Aviation Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov told your IZVESTIYA correspondent, we created a single military-strategic area, single operational-strategic planning and personnel training, a single system for the order and purchase of weapons systems, a single system for rear services and other types of logistical support, a system of military information and infrastructure, topographical and geodesic surveys, aerospace and air defenses, and a great deal else besides that constitutes the foundation of the defense capability of all the Commonwealth independent states. To destroy this system is to inflict irreparable damage.

The Minsk meeting and the discussion of defense problems will not be easy. But the heads of state have room for serious reflection on defense questions or, as military men say, for maneuver. There are many submerged reefs and potholes that may hamper agreement. Let us hope that the 11 presidents show skill and foresight in avoiding these obstacles.

Commentary on Shaposhnikov Letter to PRAVDA

PM3112155191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Dec 91 p 2

[Commentary by Vladimir Gubarev on letter to PRAVDA from USSR Minister of Defense Marshal of Aviation Ye. Shaposhnikov, citing full text of letter, under the rubric "Operation 'Nuclear Charge'": "We Are Ready To Help the Army. Why Is the Defense Minister Unwilling To Destroy Nuclear Charges? Or Unable?"]

[Text] On 14 December of this year we discussed in the newspaper how a number of public organizations have volunteered to take part in the destruction of tactical nuclear weapons. Real, not mythical destruction.

In the same issue we published a letter to USSR Defense Minister Marshal of Aviation Ye. Shaposhnikov asking for help in such an unusual affair. Yesterday we received an extremely strange reply from the USSR defense minister. We cite it in full:

"The USSR Ministry of Defense has examined your proposal of 6 December of this year on holding an auction 'to sell off and destroy nuclear charges [zaryad]' at an enterprise of the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry under the auspices of the participants in the auction.

"In the USSR Ministry of Defense's opinion, holding such an auction is unacceptable for the following reasons:

"In accordance with M.S. Gorbachev's initiative of 5 October 1991, consultations are being carried out with U.S. governmental organizations on issues of safe and ecologically responsible techniques of storing and transporting nuclear munitions and methods of utilizing nuclear charges and increasing nuclear safety. Carrying out the action you propose before mutually agreed positions are worked out could provoke a negative reaction from the U.S. side, since it is impossible to rule out a leak of information about the design of nuclear munitions to nonnuclear countries, which could lead to the violation of existing accords on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons:

Dismantling nuclear munitions, and especially their nuclear charges, is a dangerous operation and in line with existing documents is carried out by the minimum necessary number of trained specialists. The presence of other persons while this operation is carried out is forbidden.

[signed] Ye. Shaposhnikov

We regard Marshal Ye. Shaposhnikov with respect, and understand perfectly that it is difficult (indeed, not necessary!) for him to delve into all the subtleties connected with the manufacture and destruction of weapons. That is the business of the people who create them. The same goes for the problems of proliferation: The military should fulfill the decisions which are signed by the government in the framework of various international agreements.

So, on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. This is not a problem only for us and the United States, but for also for the scores of other countries which signed the treaty. And responsibility for monitoring its fulfillment is invested both in the countries which possess nuclear weapons and in the International Atomic Energy Agency. And we understand perfectly well how dangerous is the spread of nuclear technology. Therefore, the first thing which we tried to provide for in organizing the auction was precisely this problem. More than that, we consulted with the creators of the nuclear weapons and received assurances that the process of dismantling and destroying a specific nuclear charge could be carried out without "leakage of information and technology."

A small digression. I have been at nuclear tests and have observed experiments in peaceful nuclear explosions—and there was only one condition: never enter the "silver booth" where the "device" is assembled. This agreement was always observed. And in the case of dismantling a nuclear charge, things can be provided for and organized in such a way that the "technological details" do not become known. With the gigantic experience of secrecy which we have accumulated over recent decades, this does not constitute any difficulty, believe you me, comrade minister.

As for the second argument, it is awkward even to talk about it. We must not scare people! As is well known, charges have been dismantled observing all safety measures, and not once did the situation the letter speaks of arise. And it was the bureaucrats who always prefer to say "No," because that is much safer than to think and to act, who issued instructions and all manner of "prohibitions."

It is a pity that the esteemed minster is under the thumb of the bureaucrats, but we hope that at their meeting the heads of state will not only discuss the situation vis-a-vis nuclear weapons, but will also outline ways of eliminating them. The method suggested by the initiators of the "nuclear auction" not only helps solve the problem of the global security of each state and the planet as a whole, but also proposes concrete ways of solving the problem. We are ready to help the Army; why does it reject an outstretched hand?

Lobov Speculates on Future of Army Reforms

92UM0278A Moscow NEZAVISIMIYA GAZETA in Russian 21 Dec 91 p 2

[Interview with General of the Army Vladimir Lobov by Pavel Felgengauer; date and place not given: "How the Chief of the General Staff Was Removed; General Lobov: 'I Was Relieved from My Position Because of Articles in Newspapers'"]

[Text] **General of the Army Vladimir Lobov (professor, doctor of sciences, USSR people's deputy, etc.) was rather unexpectedly (at least it was a surprise to him) appointed chief of the General Staff. On 7 December, just as unexpectedly, he was relieved of his position by an ukase of President Gorbachev. Preparation for the removal of General Lobov was carried out in great secrecy (there were no rumors, which, for the General Staff, is a rarity). A week before the dismissal, the chief of the General Staff was sent on a visit to England, and he was dismissed immediately on his return. As a NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA correspondent learned, senior officials of the British Defense Ministry believe that they were placed in an awkward position: "We expended a lot of effort on organizing the visit of the chief of the General Staff, but it was all for nothing."**

[Felgengauer] Vladimir Nikolayevich, how did you find out that you no longer command the General Staff?

[Lobov] An official visit by the chief of the General Staff to Great Britain was being prepared. For the first time in the history of our country. But the situation here was rather complicated—in the Caucasus and in other regions—so I said more than once to Minister of Defense Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov that the visit should be postponed, but he insisted on the trip. On 1 December, before my departure, I was with the minister, and I talked to him—everything was normal.

The visit to England was completely successful, and I even visited the English strategic nuclear submarine base in Holy Loch, Scotland. We also visited on board a nuclear missile carrier. On 6 December, at 2300 hours, we flew into Moscow, and on 7 December, Saturday, I was at work at 0715 hours (he usually arrives at 0745). I decided to report to him about the trip immediately. Approximately this dialogue took place.

Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov. You know, Vladimir Nikolayevich, we will not drag this out. You have been writing a lot recently in newspapers and journals...

Vladimir Lobov. Well, you see, these articles are for reflection...

Ye. Sh. Yes, but, you know, we have different points of view; therefore, it will be difficult for us to work.

V. L. I see, Yevgeniy Ivanovich, I do not have any grievances against you. Today, it is my turn, and the next is yours.

Ye. Sh. Well, do not be offended!

V. L. But I am not offended.

Ye. Sh. Samsonov will come now.

V. L. What Samsonov?

Ye. Sh The commander of the Leningrad District; he is waiting for you; he was invited last Friday.

V. L. Fine. You see, it seems that you also foresaw this.

Ye. Sh. Vladimir Nikolayevich, wait a minute. There will be a collegium now. So, do not come. I will announce it myself.

At the collegium, the minister announced that I did not feel well, and he gave the report about the release from duty because of illness.

General Samsonov came. I turned everything over to him, explained everything, what is what, and immediately vacated the office. I called the people who are involved in nuclear matters, and I joined in so that the new chief of the General Staff knew where to start.

It is the second year that I have not had leave, so I went to the minister, and he signed a leave document for me. Since that day and hour, I have not had any meeting with the minister.

I also had a telephone conversation with Mikhail Sergeyevich. After all, I was the chief of the General Staff, and he was the commander in chief. It turned out that he knew everything, even that I was on leave. He told me to complete the leave—afterwards, he said, everything will become clear.

(As became known to a NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA correspondent, on 14 December, Minister of Defense Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov sent a memorandum to President Gorbachev in which he proposed the discharge of General Lobov from the ranks of the Armed Forces.)

Well, as for the essence of what happened, concerning those "disagreements" or "differences" about which Marshal Shaposhnikov speaks, then, after all, it is known that he himself announced in the Supreme Soviet that he is ready to be a civilian minister of defense. Afterward, he walked around the ministry in civilian clothes for several days. And he assigned me a similar task: To develop that kind of version of military reform where the Ministry of Defense should be a civilian establishment. Accordingly, I published several articles to prepare public opinion. Then, suddenly, at the end of November, the minister changed his views: A military minister must be military, period. But the articles had already been submitted to the press...

By the way, the minister himself prompted me to write. For example, regarding the article in NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA (No. 148) "The USSR Armed Forces: How Much Will Their Unity Cost?" the resolution was as follows: "To Lobov. Do we really not have enough forces to respond to all of this adequately?" And he even underlined it.

[Felgengauer] The written word has always been treated with great respect in Russia, but were there not any really more important reasons for your dismissal?

[Lobov] I do not know any other reasons, in any case, official ones. It is possible that there were some kind of other hidden reasons, but no one ever talked to me about them. But, after all, I was appointed to the position by the State Council (it was not coordinated with me then either—I learned about it from television). But I was dismissed, in fact, by the defense minister, through the president. In addition, I am a USSR people's deputy. According to the law, I can be dismissed only with the concurrence of the Supreme Soviet. I am 56 years old. I cannot be discharged for reasons of age, only for service inadequacy, reduction in force, or for illness. Inasmuch as the other points were not appropriate, they wanted to discharge me for reasons of illness, but it did not work out for them—I did not write the request.

[Felgengauer] Tell me, in your opinion, why was your dismissal like an unnecessarily dramatized conspiracy?

[Lobov] I think that if I had been here nothing like this would have happened. I would have objected. I would have been able to answer a question that was raised directly. But, you see, everything was done while I was in England.

I should say that I do not have any grievances against the minister. He is an extremely capable person, and democratic. Apparently, he fell under someone's influence.

[Felgengauer] But you believe that there was some kind of political reason? There are rumors that you were removed so quickly from your position, because you were preparing a military coup...

[Lobov] What kind of coup? I had not been with the troops even once in three months. I was not even in one regiment, and not in one institution. I did not have the time: I was working. What kind of conspiracy? With whom? I do not play politics. But, evidently, I have such an unfortunate fate: Within a year, I have been dismissed four times from my position. This year I buried my mother, and my younger brother... It is quite a bit for one person in one year.

[Felgengauer] Tell me, is it the practice in the Army, to put it mildly, to treat people unkindly?

[Lobov] When a general of the Army is treated this way, then you can imagine how things stand with others.

[Felgengauer] Within a day after the hurried appointment of the new chief of the General Staff, the Belovezhskaya agreement was signed, which put an end to the USSR. But, after all, a single Soviet Army remained. How in your opinion should the Army react to recent events?

[Lobov] It is impossible to remain in an amorphous, suspended state all the time. The Army needs clarity. I think that Yeltsin took an extremely courageous step. He found an outcome. After all, this is not a "pulling apart," as many are saying, but a unification.

[Felgengauer] That is, the Army will be unified in principle, despite the appearance of a considerable number of "commanders in chief?"

[Lobov] The strategic forces will be delegated to the center—everyone agrees with this.

[Felgengauer] But it is not clear where the center is now?

[Lobov] It is most likely that an agreement will be reached. A unified command will be created. The General Staff has been examining the most diverse versions of the new structure of the Armed Forces. But the final version of a military doctrine has not been worked out yet.

However, a new chief has arrived now who does not know any of this on the scale of the whole army (he never worked in the General Staff). His assistants have been in their positions for two months (the three principal deputies). They have not even sorted out the particulars of the structure of the General Staff.

[Felgengauer] The governments of a whole number of Soviet republics (including Ukraine, which is a founder of the Commonwealth of Independent States) have decided to establish their own armies. But, after all, the number of non-nuclear armaments in Europe is regulated by the treaty on conventional armaments, which was signed in November 1990 in Paris, and which has not been ratified yet. If this treaty, nonetheless, goes into effect, how then will the quota of armaments that was allotted to a united Soviet Union be divided?

[Lobov] If there will be a Commonwealth of Independent States, then, most likely, there will be a council of the heads of states (we in the General Staff examined a similar version long before the conclusion of the Belovezhskaya agreement). This organ will be able to decide such questions. But if some kind of an assembly is created, like the European Parliament, then it could ratify international treaties and see to their implementation.

[Felgengauer] How can your dismissal have an effect on the progress of reforms?

[Lobov] If they begin to rush from one thing to another, then it is very probable that there will be a lot of difficulties. But that which has already been deliberated, and that which has already been planned, will be implemented. A lot was done in three months: Unified strategic deterrence forces were created, the shift to a professional army was prepared, the period of compulsory service was reduced to 18 months, and measures were undertaken for the social protection of officers, and many other things.

[Felgengauer] What is the future fate of the officers who came to the General Staff together with you?

[Lobov] Well, I selected specialists and doctors of science: in military economics, in military diplomacy, in military art, and in military history. I wanted to rely on science, on trained people. Now, of course, they will be replaced. The new chief will bring his own people, but I was promised that all of them will be placed in some way. Such people should not be wasted.

Central Asian Servicemen Examine Possibilities

LD3112120791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian

[Text] The troops stationed on the territory of a number of the republics of Central Asia are eagerly awaiting the publication in the press of the decisions of the Minsk meeting of the Commonwealth of Independent States leaders. In many garrisons during these days there have been meetings recently at which demands were made for the retention of single armed forces, the resolution of servicemen's social problems, and also the inadmissibility of making any decisions concerning the Army without prior consultation with the servicemen, and primarily with the officer corps.

It is also noted that servicemen take a respectful attitude toward the problems of the sovereign states, and are ready to ensure their security from external aggression. At the same time, the servicemen are insisting that the question of the possibility of their departure from the republics be examined. It is noted that if their demands are not met the officers' meetings retain the right to resolve their destiny independently. There is even mention of the possibility of independently withdrawing units with their hardware from the region.

While making a positive assessment of the activity of the presidents of the sovereign states in the field of politics and economics, the officers' meetings believe that at this difficult time it is essential for the presidents of the states to have more objective information on the state of affairs among the troops and for them to meet the officers.

Funding for Fledgling Armed Forces Difficult

PM3112140991 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Dec 91

[Report by A. Sidorov, identified by caption; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] [Sidorov] There is no longer a single Union Army. How will this affect the balance of forces in the world? It is obvious that the armed forces of most of the republics will finally be truly defensive. They will fulfill limited tasks exclusively on their own territory. They can hardly present a real threat to other states. The funds for their maintenance are limited. Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, which have nuclear weapons and a relatively big arms and military personnel potential, are hardly likely to use them for aggressive aims. Difficulties in funding the armed forces will be felt for a long time to come.

Our former adversary, the United States, is already withdrawing its forces from Europe and plans to continue to do so, including in the longer term also all the country's bases and sites. The European states' armies are essentially intended only for the defense of their own territories.

It is quite likely that the disintegration of the single Soviet Army may lead to the establishment of a more secure situation in the world community, no matter how paradoxical this may seem.

Baltic Affairs

Talks on Commonwealth Postponed Until 6 Jan

*OW3112183291 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1510 GMT 31 Dec 91*

[Transmitted by KYODO]

[Text] The December 30 meeting of the heads of Baltic countries has been postponed till January 6. The negotiations did not take place because the Estonian Chairman of the Supreme Council Ruutel did not show up.

The meeting is supposed to work out guidelines on cooperation between Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia with the Commonwealth of Independent States.

Estonia

Troop Presence 'Contradicts' International Law

*OW3012162391 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1400 GMT 30 Dec 91*

[Transmitted by KYODO]

[Text] The Estonian Foreign Ministry released a statement December 29 saying that the legal status of the USSR Armed Forces on Estonian territory contradicts with international law, as well as laws of the Russian Federation and the former Soviet Union.

The statement notes that the former Baltic Military District was renamed by the Soviet military command the Northwestern group of forces. As is known, the statement points out, groups of forces are the USSR Armed Forces' continents stationed on territories of other countries under bilateral agreements.

"The Baltics have not concluded such agreements", the statement notes.

Latvia

Ministers View Fuel Shortage, Food Situation

*LD2912211691 Riga Radio Riga Network
in Latvian 1833 GMT 27 Dec 91*

[Text] The Latvian Council of Ministers met today and primarily discussed the government's foreign currency fund in which foreign currency deductions from all enterprises must be noted, including deductions from foreign enterprises which do business in foreign currency.

Discussion also began on the question of licensing nonfood products. In the future this licensing will be done only by the Ministry of External Trade. Procedures for exporting timber were decided today.

During the first part of the session a decision was also adopted on awarding the service rank of police colonel to Minister of Internal Affairs Ziedonis Cevers. Supreme Council Chairman Anatoliy Gorbunovs and chairmen of councils and executive committees of rayons and towns participated in the second half of the session.

Ivars Godmanis, chairman of the Council of Ministers, began his speech with the question: How will we live next year? He noted that at present there were foodstuffs available everywhere in the rayons but that this temporary stability could be disrupted by a fuel shortage; without gasoline, agricultural products cannot be delivered to processors and products cannot be delivered to shops. The self-governing areas must know how fuel is being used, who has enough, and who needs it.

The scarcity of industrial goods is causing concern because the money farmers receive for their products could soon turn out to be superfluous if there is nothing to buy in the shops. The prime minister believes that barter deals, in which even as much as 90 percent of products are exchanged, must be discontinued. Those enterprises which produce consumer goods must have their own shops, without the mediation of a center.

Representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture, the Union of Consumer Societies, the Riga Executive Committee, and the Ministry of Transport talked about the situation.

There is enough bread and beef, and there are also enough vegetables. But that is not the case with many other products. The industrial goods situation is difficult; footwear and work clothes for farmers are especially needed.

All the speakers agreed, however, that the question of fuel was most important. For example, on 28 December an emergency situation regarding heating will be declared in Madona. Buses have not been running in that town since 14 December.

The supply of fuel from Russia, from the eastern regions, is still experiencing complications. The prime minister therefore tasked the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Foreign Trade with establishing contacts with OPEC countries, with which it will be possible to exchange oil products for timber. The fuel will be used in rural areas for sowing and other jobs.

Government representatives will meet 28 December with the heads of industrial enterprises producing consumer goods.

Lithuania

Landsbergis Terms CIS 'Positive Phenomenon'

*LD0101060792 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network
in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 30 Dec 91*

[By correspondent Vitas Usas]

[Text] This morning, Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis received a delegation of chairmen of German Youth Association organizations, from [name indistinct?] Land. This organization, in fact, aided Lithuania a great deal during the economic blockade period and was one of the first to adopt a resolution urging the Soviet Union and its own government to recognize Lithuania's independence.

During the course of the meeting, they expressed interest in the progress of economic reforms, the general situation in Lithuania, and the position toward the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS].

Vytautas Landsbergis observed that the creation of the Commonwealth is a positive phenomenon. "We are going to maintain relations with it and with the individual states."

Politicians View Commonwealth Formation

LD0101051192 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0200 GMT 31 Dec 91

[By Juozas Kavolis with recorded passages from interviews with Kazimieras Motieka, deputy chairman of parliament; Deputy Jonas Tamulis; and Defense Minister Audrius Butkevicius]

[Text] [Kavolis] Leaders of the former Soviet republics that now comprise the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] met today in Minsk. The 11 leaders discussed how the new system of states emerging in place of the Soviet Union should be governed, giving special attention to the issue of the reorganization of the Soviet Armed Forces.

In general, the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the emergence of the CIS are regarded here in Lithuania as a natural process.

However, there is enough uncertainty in this as well. If the Commonwealth is within the same external borders and has a unified armed forces and the same currency system, it will be rather similar to the former Soviet Union, Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian parliament, said recently.

Speaking at the third congress of Sajudis, he incidentally gave a warning concerning the still-existing possibility that Lithuania could be drawn into the new Commonwealth.

Meanwhile, a considerable number of Lithuanian politicians think that the CIS is only a temporary formation that will prepare for the appearance of completely independent states.

Kazimieras Motieka, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian parliament, is of such an opinion.

[Motieka] In the future, we will deal with independent states and not with some kind of union, and we will base our relations on the basis of equal rights. I think this is the most important matter which Lithuania needs at the moment and which Lithuania will aspire for in future.

[Kavolis] The first weeks of the existence of the CIS revealed the contradictions among the former Soviet republics, which, according to Deputy Jonas Tamulis, who was talking to Vilnius radio, will tear apart the rather artificial structure of the new states. Therefore, speaking about the influence of this structure on Lithuania and on other Baltic states, first of all one must look at how the process of the disintegration of the Soviet Union will develop further, said Jonas Tamulis.

[Tamulis] I think that the problem in this situation lies in the rate and how this disintegration will proceed. If it is an uncontrolled disintegration, then there is no doubt that, in the collapse of a colossus of this size, some fragments will fall here too. There is no doubt about that.

Taking a practical look at the process currently taking place, I assess it positively—that is, looking at the transition stage toward the CIS, I think it is a positive process, because instead of a sudden huge avalanche, it stabilizes the situation, enables control of it. It is not clear how much this process will be controllable, because much will depend on the economic situation.

[Kavolis] It looks as if at the moment not a single member of the CIS has territorial claims to Lithuania. However, quite recently, when only the Baltic states had declared their independence, threats from Moscow and Belarus were reaching Lithuania that allegedly certain Lithuanian territories belonged to the above Soviet republics. In the meantime, interstate treaties have been signed by Lithuania, both with Russia and Belarus, which today belong to the CIS. So far, the Lithuanian-Russian treaty has not yet been ratified by the Russian parliament.

Deputy Jonas Tamulis said he remembered the previous statements by Belarus with concern.

[Tamulis] I am still concerned about some statements made by Belarus. If you remember last year and at the begining of this year, frequent territorial claims were made by Belarus, and what is most surprising, these were supported by both the official Communist Party authorities and the People's Front, which was in opposition. These are rather unpleasant symptomatic occurrences. Shushkevich has adopted an entirely different position; however, I am not sure about the conclusive firmness of his position on this issue.

[Kavolis] The Soviet troops which continue to be deployed in Lithuania have practically lost their master. It is a paradox that the armed forces of a state which no longer exist are still deployed in an independent state. The CIS leaders intend to solve this and other problems. Meanwhile, the threat to Lithuania remains, said Kazimieras Motieka, deputy chairman of the parliament.

[Motieka] The threat remains, and it will remain as long as the former Soviet Army continues to be deployed in Lithuania. Later, much will depend on what kind of policy will be adopted by the CIS.

[Kavolis] Audrius Butkevicius, national defense minister, thinks that the threat to Lithuania comes not only from the Soviet troops deployed here, but also from the unstable situation in the former Soviet Union.

[Butkevicius] We are in a rather complex region from the point of view of security policy, in which greater confidence and security is possible only through active cooperation. However, this active cooperation should not develop into some joint defense links or joint defense plans, which of course the new Commonwealth will want from Lithuania.

I would think that the policy on security of both the new Commonwealth and Lithuania should be linked with the common, collective security of the European Community, which would be a suitable version. I think that we should cover the distance of integration into the system of the European collective security somewhat before the states of the Commonwealth do; therefore, in a sense, we could be the guiding star.

[Kavolis] In the estimation of Minister Audrius Butkevicius, while the new state processes are taking place in the old Soviet Union, a buffer or transitional states' role will fall to Lithuania and also to Latvia and Estonia. Therefore, they must find possibilities of organizing their security in a joint manner. In the estimation of the minister, very little is being done in this area for the time being. It appears that the position of the Baltic states will become the object of discussion for the immediate future, as far as the CIS is concerned.

Jonas Tamulis stated that he subscribes to the group of those who speak out for a close coordination of policy between Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

[Tamulis] As a matter of fact, although hard efforts were expended, in actuality, foreign policy is not being coordinated as to what should be done at all. There exist very few such common negotiations and conversation exchanges, with reference to coordinating, insofar as this touches upon security questions in relations with the army.

These efforts should be coordinated, especially during this current period, during which such stormy transitional phenomena are taking place in the former Soviet Union. To hold together and [words indistinct].

[Kavolis] Yet, before the coming into existence of the CIS, exhortations were heard in Lithuania urging the three Baltic states to join a new union or confederation. Such exhortations may be repeated also after the recent events in the former Soviet Union.

Parliamentary Deputy Chairman Kazimieras Motieka speaks out in favor of better coordination of the Baltic states' actions; however, he rejects the idea of any type of union.

[Motieka] It seems to me that we are too small as states to have something depend on what form our cooperation will take. We all—all three of us currently—all three states are currently living through such a stage, in which we—well, we have risen from that filth, from that mud, which had covered us—I have in mind the economic and also the spiritual and the political one. We are currently at a stage when each of the three Baltic states—we are cleaning the mud off of ourselves, and how successful we shall be in removing this mud and in beginning to breathe, with a full chest again, and to take care of our people depends not so much on some sort of search for relations among ourselves, as on the search by our three states for relations with other states.

[Kavolis] You have heard the opinions of Lithuanian politicians concerning the new processes in the East and their impact upon the Baltic States.

Defense Minister To Head Border Committee

LD0101062492 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Text] At today's government meeting, a work group was set up to examine Lithuania's border questions. It will be headed by Defense Minister Audrius Butkevicius.

The protection of the republic's economic border and other questions were also discussed at the meeting.

Government Legalizes Possession of Shotguns

LD3112113691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 30 Dec 91

[Excerpt] The government of the republic of Lithuania has decided to legalize the purchase and possession of smooth bore shotguns and ammunition by the citizens of Lithuania or by permanent residents for their self-defense. [passage omitted]

Commonwealth Issues

Yeltsin Decrees CIS Cooperation Committee

PM3112124891 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 31 Dec 91 First Edition p 3

["Decree of the President of the Russian Federation on the Formation of the RSFSR State Committee for Economic Cooperation With the Commonwealth Member States," No. 330, 27 December 1991, Kremlin, Moscow, signed by B. Yeltsin]

[Text] In connection with the formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] and the cessation of the activity of Union organs and structures, I resolve:

1. That the RSFSR State Committee for Economic Cooperation with the Commonwealth Member States be set up on the basis of the abolished Committee for Operational Management of the National Economy of the USSR and the Russian section of the Interstate Economic Committee and its apparatus and other structures.

The RSFSR State Committee for Economic Cooperation with the Commonwealth Member States is the successor in law to the commitments relating to the Russian Federation under international treaties and agreements concluded by the Interstate Economic Committee.

2. Vladimir Mikhaylovich Mashits is appointed chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Economic Cooperation with the Commonwealth Member States and RSFSR minister.

The chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Economic Cooperation with the Commonwealth Member States:

is to implement within two weeks the takeover of the buildings and premises at the following addresses: Nos. 6 and 9 Vladimirov Passage [Proyezd], Nos. 5a, 5b, and 7 Razin Street, and No. 3 Rybnyy Alley [Pereulok], and the material and technical base and other property, financial resources, and manpower of the Committee for Operational Management of the National Economy of the USSR and the Russian section of the former Interstate Economic Committee and its apparatus, including the property of enterprises and organizations subordinate to the USSR President's Apparatus servicing the apparatus of the said committees, and also including the Russian Federation's share of the USSR Government's reserves [rezerv], which is to be transferred to the reserves of the government of the Russian Federation;

is to submit within a month the committee's organizational and manning structure and proposals for the rational utilization of employees of the departments being abolished.

[Signed] B. Yeltsin, president of the Russian Federation

[Dated] Kremlin, Moscow, 27 December 1991, No. 330

Mashits Comments on Appointment

LD2812192891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 28 Dec 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Dec (TASS)—Boris Yeltsin issued a decree on Thursday, 26 December, on the formation of the Russian Federation State Committee for Economic Cooperation with the member states of the Commonwealth of Independent States, CIS. Vladimir Mashits, a 38-year-old candidate of economic sciences, has been appointed chairman of the committee—minister of the Russian Government. Vladimir Mashits, member of the "team" of Vice President Yegor Gaydar, earlier worked in various economic scientific institutions and during the last month and a half occupied the post of Russia's plenipotentiary representative for the affairs of the economic community.

In an interview with TASS, Vladimir Mashits refuted an opinion that, with the formation of the CIS and the abolition from 30 December of the Interstate Economic Committee headed by Ivan Silayev, economic relations between the republics were not coordinated at all. "This coordination is built on bilateral relations between the CIS members as well as on general principles covering the problems that are important to all states of the Commonwealth", he said.

The minister also does not see a great problem in the fact that at the current stage of radical economic reforms the countries of the CIS do not have a single central government: "Any normal Commonwealth starts not with a central government but with understanding between the parties. As long as complete understanding is not achieved, no central government is possible".

Regarding the decision made on Monday, 23 December, by Boris Yeltsin and Mikhail Gorbachev to abolish the Interstate Economic Committee (IEC) on 30 December, Vladimir Mashits said, the Russian Committee for Economic Cooperation "will be created on the basis of the IEC. We are not going to lose its qualified cadres and we will try to find jobs for them on the Russian committee".

Speaking about concrete issues of coordination of actions between the CIS members during the period of reforms, Vladimir Mashits touched upon the problem of the introduction of various coupons for goods in some republics. Will these measures lead to the aggravation of economic relations between the members of the Commonwealth and what will Russia's reaction be? "Of course we understand that there is an objective reason for introducing coupons in some republics. They have a real crisis with an amount on hand," the minister replied. "On the other hand, this phenomenon is of a negative nature from the point of view of the stability of a single monetary system. Therefore Russia will take, evidently, an intermediate position and will seek a compromise solution to the problem".

Another "hot" problem is connected with the fact that Russia plans a state budget for 1992, practically deficit free. However, the only emission bank of the CIS is Russian. It is not ruled out that a situation might arise in which it will be to the advantage of some members of the Commonwealth to have large state budget deficits and internal state debts in order to clear them off at the expense of the Russian emission and in fact at the expense of increasing the Russian state budget deficit and its internal debt. "If this is the case, we will take a rather tough position and will ascribe excessive expenditure by the republics to internal debt accounts of sovereign states. It will make them think about what it means to build up one's internal debt. In case this negative tendency intensifies, Russia will take necessary protective measures," Vladimir Mashits said.

Burbulis Interviewed on Minsk Meeting Results

LD3112202891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Interview with Russian Deputy Prime Minister Gennadiy Burbulis by correspondent in Moscow on 31 December; recorded—from the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent] Gennadiy Eduardovich, what are the main results of the last meeting in Minsk?

[Burbulis] I think that they naturally continue and reinforce what was achieved on 8 and 21 December. We are beginning to elaborate the complex but very necessary rules of a joint compromise. If we look at the overall results, these are fairly businesslike. All members of the Commonwealth stated their unanimity with regard to the creation of joint strategic forces with a single command and single control of nuclear weapons. The Russian president was entrusted with exercising—with the agreement of the other heads of state—direct control of the nuclear button. The right of each member-state of the Commonwealth to create its own general purpose armed forces on its own territory was confirmed.

Marshal Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the joint armed forces, was charged with carrying out conciliatory research work, over a period of two months, with each Commonwealth state to determine its place within the structure of joint troops.

A commander in chief of border troops, Marshal Kalinichenko, was appointed, and we thereby strengthened one of the most important sectors in our defense structure, the borders of the Commonwealth members. At the same time, he was instructed to determine with each of the states the form in which they are most interested in defending their borders, while observing the interests of the Commonwealth as a whole.

The second tier of the document relates to the supreme body of the Commonwealth, the Council of Heads of State and the Council of Heads of Government. The standing orders stipulate that the Council of Heads of State should meet no less than twice a year, and the Council of Heads of Government no less than once every three months. We are, however, very well aware that in the period immediately ahead they will be in demand considerably more often, and a special procedure has been established to deal with this.

We also had to make a decision on the next meeting, without putting it off for long. This meeting will take place in Moscow on 25 January, a meeting of the heads of government of the Commonwealth countries. We intend, first of all, to have an urgent exchange on the process of the people's reaction to the price freeing that the majority of states are to undertake on 2 or 3 January.

In general, I believe that a new phase in the formation of the Commonwealth's collective decisions is beginning. This entails real difficulties, but at the same time we are convinced that the work at Minsk was sufficiently constructive and promises more of a consensus for the new year than there was last year.

Burbulis Interviewed on Commonwealth Measures

LD3012050591 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1734 GMT 29 Dec 91

[Interview with State Secretary G. Burbulis, first deputy chairman of Government of Russia, by correspondent Andrey Pishchayev in Burbulis' office on 29 December on the "Facing Russia" program—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Pishchayev] So you believe that in the New Year everything will be well?

[Burbulis] I do not believe, I am convinced and I realize that our present work, our program of reforms is vitally necessary, and there is more and more confirmation of the fact that the majority of Russians, despite all the difficulties, have an interest in seeing them implemented in practice.

[Pishchayev] At a news conference this week, you called the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] a new historic community. We have already had one historic community, the Soviet people, in our history. Does it not work out that we are just pouring new wine into old bottles? Especially as the other day Lithuanian leader Landsbergis said in effect that the USSR did not practically differ in any way from the CIS: a single army, a single border, a single currency. Your opinion?

[Burbulis] Yes, there are difficulties in understanding what we have managed to do in Minsk and Alma-Ata. There is a certain amount of prejudice that joint interests are also an inheritance of the imperial system. There are even candid persons who for one reason or another do not want anything to work out right for us. But at the same time, I can see and sense and testify that much that is fundamentally new has opened up, and the meeting of the heads of governments which we held on Tuesday confirms that there is now a completely different relationship to the matter. It is not a relationship of suspicion, of perfidy, of profound doubt. It is a relationship between equals who have a mutual interest in finding a way out.

[Pishchayev] And nevertheless it is thought that there are very many contradictions between the members of the CIS. Will it not turn out to be snow which quickly melts?

[Burbulis] As for the Russian leadership, Russia today will do everything it can so that the constructive and practical prospects laid down in Minsk and Alma-Ata come to fruition. At the same time, we rule out any suspicion or pressure on our part toward the other states belonging to the Commonwealth.

[Pishchayev] We know that Ukraine is planning to introduce coupons on the territory of its state. Alma-Ata prefers to keep nuclear weapons and not destroy them, although Ukraine is prepared to [words indistinct]. How will a consensus be found on these questions and is one possible?

[Burbulis] [passage omitted] Kazakhstan: In fact, President Nazarbayev has been asserting that in the next few years Kazakhstan intends to remove and destroy strategic nuclear weapons on its territory. But this does not in any way contradict the measures approved by the agreement that control of these weapons has been transferred by the members of the Commonwealth States which hold nuclear weapons to Russia and its president.

[Burbulis] Therefore, in this case, it is a moral-political, rather than a military-strategic position.

[Pishchayez] You have just touched upon the issue of bank notes. [passage omitted]

[Burbulis] Price liberalization is just an element. Today, I can report to the Russians, with a certain amount of pride, that last week, most fundamental and crucial documents were adopted which must form the regulatory basis...

[Pishchayev, interrupting] You are talking about privatization...

[Burbulis, interrupting] I am talking about the privatization program which envisages a strict division of objects into federal, republican, kray, oblast, and municipal ones, and offers sufficiently strict rules to stimulate the process of privatization, and we think that we have succeeded in the elimination of excessive social tension in this sphere. And I am observing, with satisfaction, that as far as this program, and the time schedule for its implementation is concerned, we have received full support from the Supreme Soviet and its Presidium. Finally, a whole number of fundamental documents which prove that today we have every reason to talk about a radical agrarian reform. I mean the decree by Boris Nikolayevich on the urgent measures concerning the land reform.

[Pishchayev] However, let us return to privatization. There is an opinion that privatization is far from perfect...

[Burbulis, interrupting] Privatization in the field of the trade and processing industry, starting from small and medium-sized enterprises, is one thing. Another matter—the privatization of the monsters of military-industrial economy, with their thousands-strong collectives, and very strange technology, which seems to have always been rather advanced, in certain aspects, and at the same time is too limited to be flexible when the items it should produce change. Therefore, privatization is a big task, which we are going to implement, taking into consideration the kind of industry involved, as well as region, territory, social and professional status, as much as possible. There are territories where this could be done quickly and less painfully; there are also territories where a whole system of preparation of the population, through information and propaganda, among other things, will be required. This is our immediate task today.

[Pishchayev] By the way, it was prognosticated yesterday, at the meeting between the government and the deputies that, by the autumn, there will be price stabilization, the market will be saturated with goods... Do you think this is realistic?

[Burbulis] This is one of the possible scenarios. We know quite well the variations in the ways the processes may develop. But the essence is such that, still, the majority of the population has learned to rely upon their own devices, and has certain hidden reserves—I do not only mean the home stores and things people have in their refrigerators, but also the reserves of the soul, the reserves of psychology, and the reserves of this solidarity, the solidarity of the whole country.

[Pishchayev] On 25 December, at the 11th plenum of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions, Chairman Klochkov accused the Russian Government of implementing reform without consulting the trade unions. What is your reaction to statements like that?

[Burbulis] I regard statements like that as evidence of a sincere desire to take part in drawing up government decisions, which are most often bound up with the interests of the majority of the working people, and I react perfectly normally and calmly to them. We are setting up structures, and we invite everyone—and not only the independent trade unions but all the other trade unions; and not only the trade unions, but also political parties, and above all professional structures—entrepreneurs, businessmen—everyone who is to any degree organized in some sort of structure now—to cooperate with us. But I should like to emphasize to everyone without exception that in the situation that has taken shape, there is no body which is more committed to defending the rights of the working people than President Yeltsin's government.

It is another matter entirely that today, now, everyday, this task of ours is not seen that way. But anyone who impedes us, who doubts our program, is acting at odds with the interests of citizens of the Russian Federation. Anyone who is ready to back us, who is ready to give practical assistance, however, is indeed acting in the interests of the majority of Russian Federation citizens.

[Pishchayev] The government has for the first time lined up a deficit-free budget. Pavlov's budget was also a low-deficit budget—will ours come to the same end?

[Burbulis] We have the principles of forming a deficit-free budget, which we will have to adjust every month, taking account of what is actually happening with the pricing system and, accordingly, with the money flow, and of how we manage to regulate these. This is not our own invention, it is a world task; and it is no whim on our part, it is quite simply the measure without which it is wholly useless to take any steps at all to improve the economy as a whole. And if we for any reason start abusing this once again, and seek to get finance for the spheres which will destroy and hinder this deficit-free budget for us, then we shall be acting in the Soviet way [po-sovetski]. And that means trying to solve one localized, individual task right here and now, thereby only aggravating the economic consequences for everyone together in the short-term.

[Pishchayev] And now for another topic. The Russian leadership has recently begun adopting decrees which have not been wholly popular, shall we say: I have in mind here the merging of the structures of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and the KGB.

[Burbulis] Implementing this decision in no way assumes the merging of the existing security and internal affairs bodies. It excludes any sort of personnel reshuffles or their functional organization. [passage omitted]

[Pishchayev] It will soon be the New Year in a few days. What are your wishes to the people of Russia for the New Year?

[Burbulis] I would like, on the night of the New Year, for each of us to be able to go outside, into the street, to look up at the sky, and—God grant that it be a starry sky, God grant that good Russian fluffy snow should fall—if a large snowflake should fall on to one of our rosy cheeks, then let this be a trace of the holy water, that living water which we have drunk of today, having received real freedom for Russia, and let us make our reform real together.

Filatov Interviewed on Minsk, Alma-Ata Talks

PM3012124991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Dec 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed interview with Sergey Filatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet; place and date of interview not given: "Let's Prove That Living in the Commonwealth Is Better"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Sergey Filatov was a member of the Russian delegation at the talks in Alma-Ata and he took part in drafting the documents in the working group, and it was therefore interesting to obtain first-hand information. But the events of recent days have developed so rapidly that the talk which took place at the beginning of this week had to a considerable extent lost its topicality by the end of the week, since much has become known from other sources. We have retained in this talk only what adds to what is already known.

[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA] Sergey Aleksandrovich, how was the Russian delegation formed?

[Filatov] The president determined its composition. The delegation included Burbulis, Gaydar, and Shakhray. By agreement with the chairman of the Supreme Soviet I was included. I think that the participation of leaders of the Supreme Soviet in the elaboration of the documents at the first stage is a useful thing.

[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA] Did the delegations rapidly find a common language? I ask because, after Minsk, in Ukraine, in its parliament, the Agreement of the three met with a mixed reception, to put it mildly.

[Filatov] On the first day, when the heads of state had not yet arrived, the atmosphere was tense. There was a feeling that the Ukrainian delegation had come merely to sweep aside all previous accords. Perhaps that is a subjective feeling. But caution and a certain nervousness were hanging in the air. Everything which touched if only slightly and indirectly on independence and autonomy gave rise to an exceptionally unhealthy attitude.

The first question arose around a seemingly formal but in fact important element. They said that there is an agreement signed in Minsk by the three, they are the founders of the Commonwealth. The others can associate themselves to it as they wish...

But on the other hand there is the agreement signed in Ashkhabad, there is the Declaration of Kazakhstan and the Central Asian republics, which both express the desire to join the Commonwealth but not as associates but as equal founders.

There was also Moldova, there were Azerbaijan and Armenia, which did not take part in either process.

The question arose: Who actually formed the Commonwealth?

In the working groups the members of the Ukrainian and Belorussian delegations insisted on the following form: three founders, the rest are associates. The others gave this a negative reception and everything had to be overcome.

The Ukrainian delegation, incidentally, insisted on the need to reflect specially the fact that the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] is not a state. It seemed that this goes without saying, there was no need for such a note, but obviously the allergy to a center was so powerful that the delegation demanded complete clarity on the matter.

One more agonizing discussion concerned the Armed Forces. Regarding the strategic arms and the "button" a decision was taken quickly. This problem had obviously been discussed in advance by four heads of state. Nazarbayev expressed himself on the subject as follows: The "button" should be in the possession of the elder brother. I think that in addition to purely technical reasons (another decision would have required the restructuring of the entire system of management) a degree of trust in Russia also played a part.

But directly opposite opinions were voiced regarding the control of conventional armed forces. Two republics—Azerbaijan and Ukraine—stated that conventional armed forces are under their jurisdiction. They resolutely rejected the suggestion that they be placed under the command of, for instance, a joint staff consisting of the states' defense ministers. No arguments worked.

We said: Well, how do you imagine doing it? Tomorrow will you go to the regiment or division and say: From henceforth you are ours? The men have sworn allegiance to the USSR half the men in the regiment or division are Russians. An Azerbaijani will say: I am an Azerbaijani, why should I swear allegiance to Russia or Ukraine? A Russian will say: I am a Russian, why should I swear allegiance to Azerbaijan and in addition you have what is in fact a war under way, so must I go to Nagorno-Karabakh tomorrow and shoot a Russian who has been forced to swear allegiance to Armenia?

And in the end they will all say: We will go home.

But they will go with the equipment and weapons. Divisions will go! It will be real chaos.

Shaposhnikov spoke of this with great concern. The main thing for me, he said, is to defend the Armed Forces. If you begin to divide up the Army I shall not take part in it.

For a long time people could not understand or accept this. Finally they agreed that until 30 December Shaposhnikov will command all the armed forces. On 30 December he will put his proposals on the conference table of the heads of state. It is to be expected that this problem will take up most of the time in Minsk.

[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA] There has been and is gossip around the agreement of the three. Some people assess it almost as collusion. So what is it—work done behind the scenes, or was the decision in fact unexpected?

[Filatov] If you remember, a year ago there was the draft treaty of the four. It was intended to shorten the center's arms. But at the time they abandoned the treaty, and Gorbachev's individual talks with some of the participants obviously had an effect.

How did the idea of the agreement of the three arise? I am sure it arose unexpectedly. I remember the day when Yeltsin went to Minsk. It was planned to discuss the question of the Union treaty. At the time it was already clear that Ukraine would not sign the treaty in any circumstances. But how could the Union be imagined without Ukraine? How could we allow the many centuries of ties between Russia and Ukraine to be broken?

We expected Yeltsin at 1600 hours. There was no sign of him. We telephoned. We were told that they had closed the doors, they were in discussion, no one was allowed in.

I think that when the leaders analyzed the situation they came to a responsible decision.

[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA] Of course, the meeting in Alma-Ata could not fail to discuss economic questions. The lack of coordination has reached critical dimensions. Ties have been broken. The absence of obligation on the part of suppliers is menacing...

[Filatov] Yes, there was talk about 1992. The heads of governments were instructed to elaborate a mechanism of economic relations. There was talk of making the execution of contracts and mutual deliveries binding. The honesty and punctiliousness of the Republic of Belarus were noted. Talk on this subject completed the meeting in Alma-Ata. The heads of state were unanimous: Let's fulfill all mutual commitments, let's do everything to ensure that people say that living and working in the Commonwealth is better than living and working in the Union.

[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA] It is pleasant to end talks on such a note. God grant that the Commonwealth survives all trials.

[Filatov] Have you noticed the sound of the word Commonwealth? It sounds warmer than Union, does it not? But I agree that this warm word must now be filled with the relevant content. I think that on 30 December in Minsk we will succeed in reaching coordinated, mutually acceptable, and responsible decisions.

Economic Affairs

Government Approves Privatization Program

PM3012170591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Dec 91 Union Edition p 1

[V. Kononenko report: "Russia Has a Privatization Program. But There Is No Point in Expecting Miracles"]

[Text] A government privatization program for 1992 was approved 26 December at a Russian Government session.

The government is in a hurry, as it is probably aware of all the danger of price liberalization without its obligatory companion—privatization. It is in such a hurry that when it became clear at the session that the program as a whole would do, B. Yeltsin left the hall to make arrangements with [Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman] R. Khasbulatov to urgently convene the Supreme Soviet Presidium and examine this document.

Now something about the program's basic provisions. The hypothetical criteria and approaches in it can be divided into three blocks. That is what B. Saltykov, Russian minister of science, higher education, and technical policy, believes (incidentally, he is an economist by profession); he came to the meeting with journalists in order to share his impressions on the results of the government session. The first block in the program relates to criteria on the basis of which a list of installations in various sectors that will not be subject to privatization in the new year will be determined.

This group includes mineral resources, land and water resources, the continental shelf, railroad, pipeline, and automobile routes, sites for the burial of solid waste, installations that are part of national property (so the Kremlin is not threatened with privatization), and also certain banks, archives, and many other things in that category. This also includes the greater part of the defense complex, although if there are enterprises in the Ministry of the Aviation Industry that produce tableware or refrigerators, for instance, of course they could be privatized.

The second group relates to the lower "story" of the economy—trade, the service sphere, municipal services, housing, small and medium enterprises, municipal transportation, and so on. Rampant privatization is really in evidence here. However, a great deal will depend on the local authorities—this is their prerogative.

The third group in the program refers to installations of special significance: the fuel and energy complex, the major plants that determine the structure of industry, the pharmaceutical industry, enterprises producing baby food, and enterprises producing tobacco and liqueurs and spirits. As a rule they will remain under the state's authority. However, at the proposal of local administrations and the relevant sectors, some of these enterprises may be sold into private hands or turned into joint-stock companies, but only with government permission.

Of course, it is impossible to set out all the different kinds of production shelf by shelf with utmost precision in an endless list, and the State Committee for the Management of State Property on its own is even less in the position to do so. The leaders of economic ministries at the session were particularly active in expressing their opinions on this subject. After all, they know best which plant or factory in the given sector is of secondary significance and which is of republicwide significance. Saltykov cited the following example. A major cement plant providing cement for all building sites in the oblast or the kray might be converted in the event of privatization, and construction would come to a standstill. Therefore it was decided that specific privatization programs would be compiled by sectoral commissions together with local administrations, with the State Committee for the Management of State Property seemingly called upon to provide state supervision.

Can you privatize publishing houses, and radio and television channels? It was decided that at the moment this is not worth doing, but that it will be possible and necessary in 2-3 years' time. Is the privatization of labor collectives definitely an advantage? Analysis has shown that such an approach is liable to result in everything being "squeezed out" of the assets and the enterprise being ruined, which is confirmed by the Yugoslav experience.

The document envisages attracting resources from foreign investors, particularly in the unprofitable spheres and the construction industry. They can buy both a controlling block of shares and a full block of shares. According to the estimations of the program's authors, altogether around 92 billion rubles should come into the budget in 1992 as a result of privatization, and over 300 billion in 1993.

As for the amount of work done on this document, judging by the assessments made at the government session and also in the lobbies, it is far from completion. This conclusion can be explained both by the innovatory nature of this task (it is hard to apply foreign experience to our reality) and the lack of time for approving individual elements in the program. But there is no choice, the economic crisis is suffocating us and so the Russian Government preferred to act and correct the program as it went along. It is not expecting any miracles, because we are talking here about one prescription in the treatment of a serious illness.

Gaydar Presents Privatization Program 30 Dec

LD0101131492 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1714 GMT 30 Dec 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, 30 Dec (TASS)—The text of the basic provisions of the program for the privatization of state and municipal enterprises in the Russian Federation for 1992 was presented to journalists today during a news conference given by Yegor Gaydar, vice president of the government of Russia.

This document, which was confirmed on Sunday, 29 December, by a decree of Boris Yeltsin, notes that the tasks of privatization in 1992 are to promote the general aims of the policy of economic stabilization, including the easing of the transition to free prices, by means of the accelerated privatization of enterprises in trade and in the services sphere and to free the state from the burden of maintaining the least efficient enterprises and facilities. Privatization will also be carried out with the object of ensuring a sharp increase in the economic efficiency of the activity of enterprises and increasing budget revenue.

Facilities in state and municipal ownership have been placed into four groups with regard to the possibility of their being privatized: these are facilities subject to obligatory privatisation; facilities subject to privatization but not included in the obligatory tasks; facilities restricted in their privatization (privatization is carried out with the permission of the government or of the bodies of state administration and local administration); and facilities the privatization of which is forbidden.

Subject to obligatory privatization are facilities in state and municipal ownership which influence to the greatest extent the formation and functioning of the market infrastructure of the economy of the Russian Federation and also enterprises and facilities which are holding back the rate of the country's economic development and the formation of the market because their activity is insufficiently effective.

Such facilities are enterprises in wholesale and retail trade, public catering and household services; enterprises and organizations in construction and the building materials, wares and designs industry; state agricultural enterprises (except state farms), and enterprises carrying out primary processing of agricultural output, servicing agricultural production and manufacturing production and technical output for its provision; enterprises in food and light industry; loss-making enterprises in various sectors of the national economy; mothballed facilities and uncompleted construction projects for which the normative building time period has expired.

Obligatory privatization is to be carried out in 1992 in two stages. At the first stage (first quarter) privatization is to be carried out of enterprises in wholesale and retail trade, public catering and household services; state agricultural enterprises (except state farms), and enterprises carrying out primary processing of agricultural output, servicing agricultural production and manufacturing production and technical output for its provision; mothballed facilities and uncompleted construction projects for which the normative building time period has expired.

The second stage (starting with the second half of 1992) includes the privatization of road transport and vehicle repair enterprises (apart from vehicle repair enterprises servicing a particular firm); enterprises in construction and the building materials industry; small enterprises (up to 200 workers) in food and light industry. "The Main Provisions of the Privatization Program" do not regulate the processes of privatization of state farms or the land and housing stock; nor of privatization of state (municipal) property where the legal procedure is regulated by international agreements of the Russian Federation. Privatization of social and cultural amenities is not permitted until legislative acts regulating privatization have been enacted. In 1992 it is planned to single out three groups of state and municipal property facilities with various restrictions on privatization: facilities, privatization of which is prohibited in 1992; facilities and enterprises, privatization of which is permitted only by permission of the Russian Federation government on the basis of suggestions from the Russian State Committee for State Property; facilities and enterprises, privatization of which is permitted only by permission of state administration and local administration bodies on the basis of suggestions from the appropriate committees on property administration.

In 1992, it is prohibited to privatize the Earth's resources, water resources, forest resources, air space, and the resources of the continental shelf, territorial waters and the marine economic zone of the Russian Federation; natural territories which are protected or used in special ways; facilities which constitute part of the historical, cultural and natural heritage, and facilities of artistic value and of the state exchequer of the Russian Federation (funds of the Russian State Budget, the state pension fund and other state non-budgetary funds, of the Central Bank of Russia, the gold reserve, diamond and foreign currency funds); banks and other institutions facilitating money circulation, issue of banknotes, state treasury notes, stocks, bonds and other securities; the property of the armed forces, Ministry of Internal Affairs and other establishments financed from the Russian State Budget, and also of establishments located on the territory of the Russian Federation which are financed from the USSR State Budget, enterprises and establishments of the geological, cartographic and geodesic and hydrometeorological services, and environmental and nature protection monitoring services; enterprises and establishments of the sanitary and epidemiological and vetinary services, and of services engaged in plant protection and forestry; enterprises of the patent service, standards and metrology services, and vehicle testing stations; electricity generating enterprises and facilities, and enterprises and facilities of pipeline organizations, and those engaged in construction and use of water engineering and land improvement systems and installations.

It is also prohibited to privatize in 1992 communications enterprises (excluding the "Soyuzpechat " retail enterprises), television and radio broadcasting centers; public highways and the organizations maintaining them; enterprises selling and manufacturing jewelry, orders, and medals; enterprises producing virulent poisons, narcotics, and toxic substances, as well as those carrying out the sowing, cultivation, and processing of crops which contain narcotics and toxic substances; port constructions, nuclear, training, and hydrographic fleets, the rescue fleet and the fleet used for eliminating oil slicks in seas, the "Atomflot" repair enterprise, the production association of waterways and canals, the navigation inspections, the property of underwater construction detachments; the mobilization reserves (not included in the property complex of enterprises during privatization); the grounds, buildings, structures, and equipment for the burial of industrial and domestic waste, animal burial grounds; rehabilitation workshops, enterprises of corrective labor institutions; engineering infrastructure facilities (supplies of electricity, heating , gas, water and waste-water disposal facilities, urban street lighting) and municipal landscaping as well as enterprises which operate, service, maintain, and repair the above-mentioned sites; crematoriums, cemeteries; enterprises producing fissile and radioactive materials and space vehicles; enterprises and sites providing the maintenance, launch, and escorting of space vehicles and those carrying out scientific research and experimental design work in the above-mentioned spheres.

Only by decision of the government of the Russian Federation can there be privatization of enterprises in all sectors of the national economy which are deemed by the Russian Federation State Committee for Anti-Monopoly Policy and Support for the New Economic Structures to be inalienable monopolies; of major enterprises in the national economy (with average annual value of fixed assets as of 1 January 1992 exceeding 200 million rubles, or employing more than 10,000 persons); of enterprises producing and maintaining systems and elements of any kind of weaponry, producing munitions, explosives, pyrotechnical articles, or engaged in research, scientific, testing or design work in the above fields; of installations for civil defense and for mobilization purposes; of military property and equipment for use as such; of enterprises in nuclear engineering; of enterprises in the extraction industry, with the exception of those mining local raw materials and producing toxic, narcotic, and highly poisonous substances; of enterprises processing precious metal ore, precious and semi-precious stones, and radioactive and rare-earth elements; of enterprises in the fuel-and-power complex, including those extracting and processing coal, oil and gas, petrochemical supply installations, oil depots that are transshipment bases for exports, and also oil depots of interregional and republic significance; of enterprises and branches in gas supply and the gas industry forming the integrated gas-supply grid of the Russian Federation; of enterprises in air transportation; of construction organizations and enterprises producing building materials and constructions of national significance to Russia; of state bloodstock and stud farms, horticultural selection and hybrid centres, state seed inspectorates and agricultural bodies' laboratories for grading and testing, and enterprises and farms producing valuable and anadromous types of fish.

In addition, only by decision of the government can there be privatization of the following: higher-education establishments, science and research institutions, enterprises and sites of the Russian Academy of Sciences, of the Russian Academy of Education, of sectoral academies, of the Russian Federation Ministry of Science, Higher Education and Technical Policy, of the Russian Federation Ministry of Education, of the Russian Federation Ministry of Health, sites of state-sector science centers, the "Scientific Instruments" shareholders' association, government-run preschool establishments; printing works, publishing houses, news and telegraph agencies managed by the Russian Federation Ministry for the Press and Information; enterprises in the pharmaceuticals industry and the medical-biological preparations industry; enterprises producing distilled, liqueur and vodka drinks, and tobacco goods; enterprises and organizations producing baby food; enterprises producing folk handicrafts; grain bins, refrigeration facilities, and warehousing facilities permanently storing state reserves and mobilization reserves; enterprises and installations in trade and public catering that serve employees at the place of work (including miners' settlements), wholesale trade enterprises serving Far North regions and enterprises of the nuclear-power complex; the network of state-sector sanatoria and health resorts, enterprises of urban public transportation, and enterprises for maintenance of urban transportation.

The privatization of the following is permitted only by a decision of the bodies of state administration and local administration: city taxi transportation enterprises; pawn shops; baths; laundries and hotels; enterprises, organizations and establishments for the provision of ritual services; garbage treatment works; pharmacies (with obligatory state licensing); unfinished entertainment and cultural facilities; and enterprises and facilities for the operation of movie-houses.

The following are prohibited in 1992: the holding of noncommercial competitions (that is to say without using the auction principle with regard to the price of a facility or the size of the investments); the conclusion of leasing agreements for state (municipal) property giving the lessee the right to purchase it; and the holding of an auction when there are less than two purchasers present.

The document provides a number of concessions for members of labor collectives of enterprises being privatized. When they acquire shares in enterprises which are being privatized by means of being turned into open joint stock companies they are given once only and free of charge privileged shares amounting to 25 percent of the company capital but no more than 20 times the guaranteed minimum monthly earnings per worker. Also envisaged is the sale to members of the labor collective, including pensioners, of ordinary shares with a discount of three percent of the nominal value and with deferred payment being made available for one year. At the same time restrictions are not being placed upon the sale by workers of shares acquired by them on concessionary terms or obtained free of charge.

The document points out that resources obtained through privatization, after the budget deficits of the relevant republic, kray and other soviets have been covered, can be applied for the social protection of the population, the implementation of nature protection measures and the development of the engineering infrastructure of the towns and territories.

Gaydar Stresses Need To Stabilize Economy

LD0101171992 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Remarks by Russian Vice President Yegor Gaydar; place and date not given; from the "Novosti" newscast—recorded]

[Text] Now you will hear more details about the reform program in Russia from the person who deals with the economy in the Russian Government—Vice President Gaydar.

[Gaydar] [Video shows Gaydar addressing unseen correspondent] That is the first thing. A post-communist government is carrying out this reform, but history has so determined that it is necessary to accomplish immediately at least two tasks, each of which is difficult and unpopular. We cannot permit ourselves the luxury of just unfreezing prices, not stopping inflation, and leaving it at that, because then there is a very big chance that the second task—stopping prices from rising, financial stabilization, macroeconomic stabilization—will be accomplished by a second post-communist government, and in an undemocratic way.

Gaydar Interviewed on Economic Problems, Goals

LD0101212692 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1926 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Interview with Yegor Timurovich Gaydar, deputy chairman of the Russian Government, by L. Telen, journalist of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI; place and date not given; live or recorded—from the "Nota Bene" program]

[Text] [Telen] Yegor Timurovich, apart from a sense of duty, what impelled you to accept this job?

[Gaydar] The time available for a democratic alternative of economic reforms in Russia is slipping away very rapidly. There is a sober understanding of how terrible the other alternatives are. Under these circumstances, I simply believed that there was no choice. There is nothing more to be said if you are firmly convinced that your chosen path, risky though it may be, is the only one possible, and that any alternative is either an ostrich-like attempt to hide one's head in the sand and close one's eyes to what is happening, or a road to ruin compounded by political adventurism, or merely an irrelevance.

Of course, from my own personal point of view, I would no doubt be much happier if this enormous burden now passed to my friends, with whom I sympathize, not to me. It would no doubt really be much easier.

[Telen] I remember that when you were PRAVDA editor we had the following conversation. I asked you whether you really believed that anything could be changed in that newspaper, and whether you were afraid that you would not be able to change anything. You said that no, you were not afraid of that, and if worst came to worst, you would return to the academic world and there would be nothing terrible in that. Did you have the same feeling when you joined the Russian Government?

[Gaydar] No. It is a completely different matter. It is a completely different matter. Here our defeat is unfortunately going to be more than simply our own failure. I think it will be a vast potential tragedy for this country. It is a clinical fact that a government that liberalizes prices, the first government that liberalizes prices in the context of a communist economy, almost always has to go. There is basically nothing terrible in that.

It is absolutely obvious that it has to be done. It is necessary to do it. A political price has to be paid, and someone has to pay it. So the people who are now concerned with politics, therefore, prefer to avoid such a role. Well, I am not concerned by it, and my friends are not concerned either. All this has to be paid for in one way or another, paid for politically. There are no mysteries here. Everything here is clear and simple to determine.

Unfortunately, there is a different problem here. It's not just that this is the first post-communist government that is carrying out this reform, but history has determined it necessary to immediately accomplish at least two tasks, each of which is difficult and unpopular. We cannot permit ourselves the luxury of just unfreezing prices—not stopping inflation—and leaving it at that, because then there is a very great risk that the second task, stopping price rises, seeking financial stabilization, macroeconomic stabilization, will be accomplished by a second post-communist government, and it will be accomplished in an undemocratic way.

[Telen] An undemocratic government?

[Gaydar] An undemocratic government. So, if I knew that we were accomplishing the first part, and then a second democratic government would accomplish the second part of the task, well, that would be fine. That is, for me personally, it would be a great happiness. But, unfortunately, life is not a chess game, and, yes, it seems that what is taking shape in this country is something that may not come to fruition. We must succeed in doing these two things. We must succeed in creating the preconditions for the normal working of market mechanisms, and at the same time stabilize finances.

[Telen] And are you not embarrassed by the stand of Aleksandr Rutskoy, who subjects the reforms being carried out by your government to harsh criticism—harsher and harsher as time goes by?

[Gaydar] No, I'm not embarrassed. You know, it seems to me rather... not very honest on some points. Well, how shall I put it? It's too politically profitable. All that he says is said to criticize our government. I think that it could be said better, in far more detail and more convincingly, by showing possible alternatives from the pleasant world of fairy tales. This could well be done if everything in this country, in this economy, could be managed and adjusted simply, as can be done splendidly on paper. It's another matter that such constructions are, of course, politically unprofitable. What can be said? Who likes the policy of a government that unfreezes prices? That is impossible, it cannot be liked, it is not being implemented in order to be liked.

[Telen] Tell me please, is it easy for you to work with Yeltsin?

[Gaydar pauses] It is easy and difficult. Easy, because Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin on the whole supports us very clearly. He delegates decisions on professional issues. He hardly ever introduces serious, principal—I will note, of principal significance for economic policy—amendments, which a politician might introduce who is simply concerned with popularity and how it will be received. He really is a politician whose authority in society represents vast democratic capital today. That is, it is a most important stabilizing factor. He has put it at stake, having soberly evaluated that further collapse is death both for the country and for democracy, and for all democratic politicians.

This is a very courageous decision. On the whole this is not an ordinary decision. And so far he is sticking to this decision. Maybe sometimes it is difficult because he is by nature a good man. He is a good man, he wants to make things good for people. And in fact he is profoundly nauseated by the economic role he is forced to play today, which he makes himself play. From this there naturally arises specific problems, including important ones.

[Telen] How do you foresee the moment when you resign? What will it be? Your government's decision, the decision of the president, the decision of parliament, or will your government simply be removed by new popular indignation? What would you wish yourself?

[Gaydar] I should wish a calm departure for our government into retirement after... [changes thought] sometime toward the end of next year, after success in financial stabilization, to the accompaniment of deafening shouts of public indignation [as heard].

[Telen] It will be your decision?

[Gaydar] Yes, democratic. Resignation in parliament, resignation after a vote of no confidence. This is how I would put it: no confidence in the budget for 1993 in parliament. This is my dream. [smiles]

Privatization Documents Said 'Rough Drafts'

PM0101171792 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jan 92 Morning Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "In the Russian State Committee for Management of State Property"]

[Text] The Russian Government has drawn up the State Privatization Program for 1992; a package of normative documents regulating this process in detail is being prepared. There are instances where materials are disseminated in Moscow and other cities before the official adoption of documents, and are passed off as genuine. We bring it to your notice that these materials are nothing more than rough drafts and have no juridical force. Using them could lead to many misunderstandings and losses.

The official documents on privatization in Russia will be published in a special edition of the magazine ZAKON (a supplement to the newspaper IZVESTIYA), which has been officially authorized to publish the said materials.

State Committee's Chubays on Privatization

LD0101163492 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1210 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Interview with Anatoliy Chubays, chairman of the State Committee of Russia for the Management of State Property, by unidentified interviewer, who is shown holding microphone but not speaking; questions appear in the form of screen captions; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Screen caption: To whom is Russia being sold?]

[Chubays] The president has indeed confirmed a key document which essentially marks the beginning of wide-ranging privatization in our country, and the main question he answers is the question of what the worker is going to get with privatization, what the collective is going to get with privatization. In accordance with the president's decree, when a state enterprise is turned into a joint stock company, 25 percent—that is, one quarter—of the value of that enterprise is transferred free of charge to those working at that enterprise. So that is the answer to your question: To whom is Russia being sold?

[Screen caption: The main provisions of the privatization program...]

[Chubays] The program answers a whole series of key issues in the privatization process. First and foremost, there is the question of what the pace and scale of privatization will be. We have put down tentative figures in the program making it possible to draw approximately 20 to 25 percent of state property in Russia into the privatization process in 1992. The program contains an answer to the question of how the resources obtained from privatization are spent. It says that a considerable part of the privatization resources must be used for purposes of social protection. A special normative figure for expenditure on this has been set down. These resources will be spent through the local budgets. The second area where they are to be spent is linked to ecological problems and there, too, this will be redistributed through the local budgets. In addition, some of the resources from privatization will enter the Russian budget and will be spent in accordance with the decisions of the Supreme Soviet.

The program contains precise tasks for regions, oblasts and krays, industry by industry, so that the total figure they have can be applied to the specific conditions in each town and oblast and indications can be obtained for drawing up oblast and region privatization programs, which will now start to be worked out.

[Screen caption: The mechanism of privatization...]

[Chubays] It works like this: Privatization may be initiated by a labor collective, by the administration, and also by people who do not work at the enterprise in question at all. Anyone initiating privatization has the right to lodge an application for privatization of an enterprise with the local territorial property committee; such committees now exist in every oblast center, and in many rayon centers in Russia. The property committee is bound to consider this application, and to give a clear response within the legally set period of time, within a month . The response consists of a commission being set up for privatization of the enterprise.

The issue of who has the right to be on such a commission is laid down by law. The period of time the commission can operate is restricted; within six months the commission has to draw up a plan for privatizing the facility in question. As you will understand, if it is a major enterprise involved, then the privatization plan is a serious business. It has to include valuations of the enterprise's assets, and the procedure for and form of sale. All this has to be done by the commission, after which there is the sale, that is, privatization of this facility.

[Screen caption: How is the value of the enterprise being privatized determined? Is there such a thing as objective prices today?]

[Chubays] Estimates exist today of the balance and residue value, but these by no means always reflect the real picture. I should point out that this is the most acute task for us. Immediately after the end of the program, literally within the next few days, the State Property Committee will issue regulations on the procedure for valuation of enterprises. These regulations should be the basis for your question here.

[Screen caption: What conditions are envisaged for the investment of foreign capital in the Russian economy?]

[Chubays] We have a whole section of the privatization program dealing with these conditions. We proceed from the view that we have to attract foreign capital. This will be done, and there is a whole series of measures for this. This does not mean we are prepared to sell absolutely anything to any foreign entrepreneur without any preliminary assessments at all.

In the program, we have envisaged special priorities, special conditions which will attract foreign capital into the branches of the national economy that need it most of all. One should add to this that under existing conditions—I mean the existing dollar-ruble exchange rate—a situation is emerging where an American student could earn enough dollars working during his vacation to acquire a small factory, or even two, in our country. And this will be the case as long as the dollar exchange rate is 150-170 rubles, as it has been of late. And so, we will of course be compelled to introduce certain restrictions here.

[Screen caption: When can one expect the first results from privatization?]

[Chubays] It has to be said that no matter how hard we have tried to get it going as quickly as possible, privatization is a very complicated and serious process and one must not think that if the program starts to operate from 2 January or even from 1 January then our economy will turn into a completely privatized market economy from 3 January.

I think the real results of privatization will begin to make their appearance in the economy toward the middle of the year, by the third quarter. At the same time it is absolutely clear that the situation could change over a far more dynamic time scale for certain individual enterprises and individual groups of enterprises. But in those cases where work has already been done in preparation for privatization, where different options for privatization are being discussed and schemes have been prepared, the doors are effectively open from January onwards.

Yeltsin Urged To Rethink Price Liberalization

PM0201105792 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Dec 91 p 1

[Letter to Russian President Boris Yeltsin from Vasiliy Belov, Dmitriy Zhukov, Nikolay Kotenko, Viktor Kochetkov, Igor Lyapin, Aleksey Markov, and Ivan Ukhanov under the rubric "Cri de Coeur": "Free Prices in Our Conditions Is Suicide"]

[Text] The liberalization of prices in conditions where there is a state monopoly, unprecedented corruption, crippling shortages, monstrous lawlessness, virtual anarchy, and the absence of guarantees of social protection (this is why Uzbekistan, incidentally, is refraining for the time being from the liberalization of prices), a fall in production, and reluctance on the part of private business to invest capital in productive spheres, will be counterproductive, just as were the price rises of 2 April, and will lead to real famine and to social explosions which will sweep away everything and cause total destabilization, with the potential loss of control of globally lethal structures.

In Poland the population's economic situation deteriorated after prices were liberalized. And this is evidently precisely why in the recently parliamentary elections representatives of left-wing forces came second. Bulgaria has also suffered a fiasco and rejected free prices. Rejection of free prices and a catastrophic crash inevitably lie in store for us too.

There is only one way out of the crisis: Until the severity of the shortages is eliminated, prices should not be freed, and the state order should be reintroduced (as in Tatarstan—for this reason they are stating there that they are not threatened by famine) and an all-embracing regional executive power created, composed of honest, competent, and law-abiding people, who will encourage all forms of production initiative.

[Signed] Vasiliy Belov, Dmitriy Zhukov, Nikolay Kotenko, Viktor Kochetkov, Igor Lyapin, Aleksey Markov, and Ivan Ukhanov

Retail Price Rises, Ceilings Detailed

PM0101174192 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Dec 91 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Prices"]

[Text] **We Began According to Pavlov...“**

According to the figures of the RSFSR State Committee for Statistics, the level of retail prices for consumer goods in the republic in November 1991 exceeded last year's level by a factor of 2.3. The changes in prices for food and nonfood goods are given below:

	November 1991 as percentage of November 1990
Food goods of which:	211
Foodstuffs of which:	270
meat products	328
fish products	320
animal fat	265
vegetable oil	206
milk and dairy produce	203
cheese	245
eggs	244
sugar	267
confectionery	261
tea	231
bakery products	258
groats and pulses	327
potatoes	505
vegetables	442
fruit	296
alcoholic drinks	140
passenger cars	187
Nonfood goods of which	246
cotton fabrics	295
woollen fabrics and cloth	377
clothing and underwear	314
knitwear	338
hose	251
leather footwear	284
luxury goods	240
perfumes and cosmetics	265
tobacco products	232
printed goods	229
radio goods	252
furniture	290
sports goods	256
clocks and watches	192
electrical goods	281
construction materials	265

...And We Are Continuing According to Gaydar

In connection with the liberalization of prices, the Russian Government has set ceilings on the rise in prices and tariffs for the main consumer goods (services) on sale to the population.

Certain types of bread	triple
Milk, kefir, skimmed curd cheese	triple
Baby food, including food concentrates	triple
Cooking salt	fourfold
Sugar	3.5 times
Vegetable oil	triple
Vodka and spirits	4.5 times
Matches	fourfold
Medicines and medical products, average	fourfold
Gasoline	triple
Diesel fuel	2.8 times
Lamp Kerosene	fivefold
Fuel	fivefold
Liquefied gas	triple
Mains gas	fivefold
Electricity for the population resident in:	
rural population centers	8 kopeks per kilowatt/hour
urban population centers	12 kopeks per kilowatt/hour
in buildings equipped with built-in electric hot plates and electric heaters	8 kopeks per kilowatt/hour
Water and Sewage, average	fivefold
Thermal energy for central heating and hot water, average	triple
Rent	unchanged
Passenger transport	
Rail	double
Sea	double
Air	triple
River	double
Road	double
Communications services, average	triple

Burbulis, Deputies Meet on Economic Problems

LD2912114491 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 1635 GMT 29 Dec 91

[From the "Politics" section]

[Text] First deputy premier of Russia believes the central and northern regions of Russia will have to face the toughest times in the coming two months. Things will be easier in the south and in other farming areas of the Russian Federation. Speaking at a meeting with the people's deputies of Russia on December 28th, Gennadiy Burbulis, first deputy prime minister of the Russian Federation, also stated that all economic problems Russia was facing at the moment could be overcome. However, there were no options for their overcoming, he stressed. Burbulis also said that the Russian Government was taking forced steps but these were the only ones possible. According to Gennadiy Burbulis, for the first time ever Russia had a united power structure, and a government, which was ready to take all the responsibility for everything.

We shall follow our path till our final victory, Gennadiy Burbulis stressed. The first deputy premier of the Russian Federation also said he believed that at present there was a rare combination of law and political power, and President Yeltsin would use this unique opportunity. On December 27th Russian President Boris Yeltsin made official his decision to begin a tour of the country on January 3rd. Other members of the Russian Government intend to follow suit.

Resolution on 1st Quarter 1992 Budget Plan

PM3112120091 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 31 Dec 91 First Edition p 3

["RSFSR Government Resolution No. 60, 24 December 1991, on the Draft RSFSR Budget System for the First Quarter of 1992"—signed by B. Yeltsin]

[Text] The RSFSR Government resolves:

1. That the principles for the formation of the draft RSFSR budget system for the first quarter of 1992 be accepted in the main.

2. That the main indicators of the RSFSR's socioeconomic development and the draft consolidated RSFSR budget for the first quarter of 1992 be submitted for examination by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet within a week.

3. The RSFSR Ministry of Economics and Finance:

is to draw up a draft republic budget of the RSFSR for the first quarter of 1992 and submit it to the RSFSR Government by 20 January 1992;

is to determine, in conjunction with representatives of the governments of the republics within the RSFSR and organs of executive power of krays, oblasts, autonomous formations, and the cities of Moscow and St. Petersburg, the budget relationship between the republic budget of the RSFSR and the territories' budgets on the basis of new taxation legislation and the further widening of the rights and responsibilities of local organs of executive power on questions of the formation of their own financial base in the context of the corresponding decentralization of budget expenditure;

is to approve, in the shortest possible time, a provision on the procedure for compensation for rises in prices and tariffs for products and services supplied for state needs in 1992;

is to draw up and approve, in conjunction with the RSFSR State Committee for Statistics, a procedure for organizing work to monitor changes in prices and tariffs and to make available to financial organs information on the rise in prices for products and services.

4. In order to provide financial resources for the reproduction of fixed capital, enterprises and economic organizations, regardless of forms of ownership, are to be permitted in 1992 to adjust by a factor of two, by way of indexation, the amortization payments for the full restoration of fixed capital calculated under existing norms.

The RSFSR Ministry of Economics and Finance is to draw up and convey to enterprises and economic organizations within a month the procedure for indexation of amortization payments in 1992.

5. RSFSR ministries and departments are to be permitted to set up special sector and inter-sector extrabudgetary funds for research, experimental, and design operations and for the startup of new types of high-tech output. In 1992 these funds are to be formed from payments at the rate of up to 1.5 percent of the prime cost of marketable output (operations).

6. The RSFSR Ministry of Industry is to be permitted to form in 1992 a special-purpose fund to assist in the conversion of military production, formed from payments at the rate of up to 3 percent of the prime cost of marketable output (operations) produced by enterprises in the defense complex (on the basis of a list approved by the RSFSR Ministry of Industry).

The RSFSR Ministry of Industry and the RSFSR State Committee for Defense Questions, in coordination with the RSFSR Ministry of Economics and Finance, are to establish a procedure for the formation of the said fund and utilization of its resources.

7. In connection with the considerable increase in expenditure arising from the transfer to the RSFSR's jurisdiction of budget-funded Union-level institutions and organizations, the RSFSR Ministry of Economics and Finance is to submit to the RSFSR Government proposals on bringing earlier decisions on the development of free economic zones into line with new taxation legislation and budgetary policy, so as to ensure that

economic entities in each region participate without fail in the financing of statewide expenditure with a proportion of their own income.

[Signed] B. Yeltsin

Aide Remarks on Currency Stabilization Fund

PM0101162392 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Jan 92 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report from "News" column roundup: "Will the Ruble Find the Right Rate?"]

[Text] "If the rate of the ruble does not begin to rise by February, this will mean that the government's credit and budget policy has failed," Petr Aven, chairman of the Russian Federation Committee for Foreign Economic Ties and Russian first deputy foreign minister, believes. In an interview with an RIA correspondent he stated that the Russian Government intends creating a currency stabilization fund in the next two-three months without which, in his opinion, the depreciation of the ruble cannot be halted. Petr Aven expressed the hope that Western countries will help in the creation of the Russian stabilization fund. "The application for Russia's full membership of the IMF will be prepared in the very near future," the first deputy minister said.

Agricultural Bank To Succeed Agroprombank

LD3012121691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0130 GMT 30 Dec 91

[Text] The Agroprombank—a major universal commercial bank of the former USSR—has ceased to exist. The rosselkhozbank [Russian Agricultural Bank] will become its legal successor on 1 January. It has taken over the ramified network of branches across Russia. Enterprises and organizations of the agro-industrial complex and related industries will be its main clients.

Agriculture Minister on Prospects, Problems

LD0101230292 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Russian Agriculture Minister Viktor Nikolayevich Khlystun interviewed in his office by correspondent V. Golubev; date not given; recorded—from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] You will agree that in present conditions much will depend on how our agriculture supports the reforms that have begun. Our correspondent met Viktor Nikolayevich Khlystun, Russia's minister of agriculture.

[Khlystun] In agriculture there has indeed not been an easy end to the year. The number of livestock has been dropping. The fodder situation is very difficult, but at the same time we laid down quite a good foundation during the autumn sowing period. It is hoped that we will be equally successful with the spring sowing.

[Golubev] How do you see your role as minister and how do you see the role of the ministry in these conditions—the present conditions of developing reform and such a decisive transition to the market?

[Khlystun] I see it as the speeding up of land reform. Nevertheless, during the first year we had a very large number of barriers. In the event of workers leaving collective and state farms, they received their share of land. As a rule it was very small and did not make it possible to create a peasant holding of the optimum size. We are proposing—and a resolution already provides for this—to introduce the possibility for land shares and stock shares to be exchanged. The person intending to engage in agriculture may exchange his stock shares for land shares and thereby obtain a much bigger plot of land.

Last year we wrote off debts for very many farms. Nevertheless, this year about 2,000 farms will once again be large debtors of the state. Regarding those that are plainly in a very poor state of health and in which further funds should not be invested, we have decided to have them compulsorily reorganized. As for other collective and state farms, our documents stipulate that within two months their collectives must hold meetings to consider the expediency of going over to new forms of economic management, in particular, either to an association of peasant holdings or to an open or restricted type of joint-stock company, and take a decision on this matter.

[Golubev] The right to decide remains with the people working on the land.

[Khlystun] Yes, that is the case everywhere.

Security Issues

Filatov Criticizes Yeltsin Security Decree

PM3112121191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by POSTFACTUM correspondent from roundup of IZVESTIYA, TASS, INTERFAX, and RIA reports]

[Text] Sergey Filatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, has said: "The RSFSR president's decree 'on the formation of the RSFSR Ministry of Security and Internal Affairs' is a bad decree."

S. Filatov also told a POSTFACTUM correspondent in this connection: "I do not know how this decree appeared and I believe that it is a very big step backward, particularly if you are talking of democracy. I am also worried by something else: Government communications, the president's guard, the guard of the Supreme Soviet chairman, the guard of the state power buildings—these are all individual structures and we are creating alongisde all this one more monster which includes everything, the Internal Affairs Ministry and state security—it really is like the NKVD. Simply by virtue of its ideology, not everything can be in harmony in this structure. And one man cannot manage it."

Staffers Protest Merger Decree

PM3112155591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Dec 91 p 1

[I. Kadulin report: "A General Who Does Not Wish To See His File Is Bad"]

[Text] Russian President Boris Yeltsin's decree forming the Russian Ministry of Security and Internal Affairs on the basis of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic MVD, the Interrepublic Security Service, and the FSA [Federal Security Agency] of Russia has elicited an ambivalent response from state security staffers. We have learned that Yeltsin, Khasbulatov, and FSA leader Ivanenko are receiving protest telegrams and extracts from the decisions of officers meetings of staffers of the agency's regional subdivisions: from Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Yekaterinburg, Chita, Izhevsk, Arkhangelsk, Kyzyl, etc. The crux of the protest is as follows: Chekists believe, not without grounds, that the monopolization of internal affairs and state security organs in a single pair of hands could lead to the reconstruction of a punitive system after the model of the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs and to the collapse of the established system of agent support for counterintelligence and the fight against organized crime. State security staffers are afraid that the merger of the departments will lead to the amalgamation of their information systems and materials, including those concerning high-ranking statesmen charged with corruption.

BBC radio recently cited a statement by a well-known Soviet journalist, who said that more than 300 cases instituted against militia generals will henceforth pass to the jurisdiction of Barannikov, minister of security and internal affairs. The opinion exists that Barannikov might try in this way to remove the compromising material against his retainers. Last year alone the KGB passed to the prosecutor's office operational materials on 830 members of organized criminal groupings, 190 of whom turned out to be MVD staffers.

'Overwhelming Majority' Disapprove

LD0201100792 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0300 GMT 2 Jan 92

[Text] The overwhelming majority of Russian State Security employees disapprove of the decree establishing the Russian Ministry of Security and Internal Affairs and call on President Yeltsin to suspend it, NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA reports, citing sources at the Federal Security Agency.

Russian Constitutional Court Chairman Valentin Zorkin has addressed the president with a similar demand. He asked that the decree be suspended until the court's session scheduled for 11 January.

Federal Security Agency employees are also worried by the fact that, according to their information, a KGB commission has established that those who unswervingly carried out the decrees of the organizers of the August putsch are taking an active part in determining the future of the Ministry of Security and Internal Affairs.

Security Minister Barannikov Interviewed

PM3112101191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Dec 91 Union Edition p 4

[Interview with V.P. Barannikov, Russian minister of security and internal affairs, by correspondent A. Grigoryev; place and date not given: "Viktor Barannikov: You Have To Possess Courage in Order To Preserve Democracy"—first five paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction; last four paragraphs are commentary by observer Valeriy Rudnev]

[Text] The decree by the Russian Federation's president setting up the republic's unified internal security organ has been given a concerted hostile reception. On 26 December the Russian parliament adopted virtually unanimously (just one vote against) a decision proposing that Boris Yeltsin repeal his decree in the part concerning the amalgamation of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and the FSA [Federal Security Agency] of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. On 28 December Valeriy Zorkin, chairman of the Russian Constitutional Court, sent the president an official document raising the question of suspending the decree "On the Formation of the RSFSR MSIA [Ministry of Security and Internal Affairs]" without delay.

Journalists are alarmed, suspecting the appearance of the old monster of the NKVD [People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs] in the new guise of the MSIA. B. Yeltsin, R. Khasbulatov, and V. Ivanenko are receiving protest telegrams and extracts from the decisions of chekist officer assemblies.

Russian militia officers are also concerned. It seems to them that B. Yeltsin, whom they were defending in August, has already forgotten them in December, leaving officials of the former Union structures to "command the parade" in the Russian MVD.

But this is the opposition. Who is in favor? There are few such people at present—just individuals, you might say. For example, Anatoliy Oleynikov, deputy chairman of the ISS [Interrepublic Security Service] (the former USSR KGB), Viktor Yerin, deputy minister of the former USSR MVD (both, incidentally, have already been appointed V. Barannikov's first deputies by B. Yeltsin)...

What is now lacking to complete the picture is the opinion of two persons—B. Yeltsin himself and Viktor Barannikov, whom he has appointed Russian minister of security and internal affairs. We were told nothing definite at the president's press center. They merely replied: Yeltsin will take all the "pros" and "cons" into account and will make a considered decision. But Viktor Barannikov agreed to grant an interview to our correspondent.

[Grigoryev] Viktor Pavlovich, it is already becoming a tradition that you grant to IZVESTIYA your first interview in a new post—having now taken up the post of Russian minister of security and internal affairs. Does this attest to a liking for our newspaper?

[Barannikov] I would say this: It attests that IZVESTIYA is least inclined to correct its authors. And I value this most of all...

[Grigoryev] Thank you. And straightway a question which is on everybody's lips today: It is said that the cases against 300 high-ranking corrupt officials in the militia will be halted as a result of the merger of the structures of the former MVD's and the former ISS and FSA. Is this so?

[Barannikov] Just tell me where you got such a "precise figure" and who is the author of the misinformation that is appearing in newspaper pages and on the air today. You see, I too am in an impasse. The report on this appeared even before the departments' merger. You get the feeling that someone "anticipated the event." And so it turned out that I, while still leader of the USSR MVD, was already in full charge of Vadim Bakatin's services. But this cannot be serious! It is another matter that such rumors arise precisely in the structures of the former KGB's: People there are said to be "burning agents' files" and "investigation documents" relating to "godfathers"—to use the language of that same canard—in militia uniforms. I am prepared for IZVESTIYA's correspondent to exercise journalistic control and see for himself that I will take to its logical conclusion any of the criminal cases on this question. But the actual investigation of such cases is the prerogative of the prosecutor's office.

[Grigoryev] You are the first minister to make us such an offer. And if you are so open, then please answer this question too: Are you yourself pleased with the creation of, to put it mildly, a strange "many-armed" ministry?

[Barannikov] I would not employ a term of this kind—"pleased, not pleased." There is the logic of a historical and social process. The system of society's law-enforcement protection has been put extremely out of balance by the numerous mistakes of perestroyka and by the processes engendered by the August putsch. And since the president has found such a way out of the law-enforcement crisis, I am obliged, as a representative of a law-abiding profession, to take this path.

[Grigoryev] But will you not take it back to 1937? This is on the one hand. On the other, will the innovation not harm the security of Russia, whose protection was the "hobbyhorse" of the former KGB? And, third, is even the most professional leadership component capable of coping with such a monster?

[Barannikov] First, about the monster. There is clearly some cheating going on here. After the August events the KGB lost its strongest subdivisions, which had ensured its undivided power, foreign intelligence was separated completely, and the president's guard, government communications, the KGB troops, the "Alfa" subdivisions, and other militarized subdivisions left. And we forget that, in the final analysis, only quite specific services were left in the ISS and the FSA. And the RSFSR MVD and the USSR MVD are essentially returning to their former channel. What question is there of a "new monster"?

Second question. About a possible muddle in functions and the loss of the professional chekist link. Yeltsin's decree speaks unambiguously about the inadmissibility of any mechanical merger of services. And my first order relating to the MSIA speaks of the same thing equally unambiguously. Of course, no one in the State Motor Vehicle Inspectorate, for example, intends to send employees to reinforce counterintelligence. That would be stupid. But for some reason precisely stupidity becomes a very effective weapon when it is necessary to block a particular process. And now gossip is already going around: Since the minister comes from the militia, the militia will deal with counterintelligence. Nonsense! Now about the attitude associated with analogies with 1937.

I am sure that what matters is not only the actual model of the executive law-enforcement mechanism but, above all, the system of control over it. Society has become transparent: You cannot conceal anything in it, and sooner or later everything becomes apparent. And this transparency has reached such a high degree since August that no usurpation of power is conceivable. And again: Why do we hear absolutely everywhere the thesis that the MSIA is an organ which both conducts the investigation itself and metes out punishment itself?... How did things stand in its constituent parts before? With the possible exception of the KGB, in which there were no corrective labor establishments, everything was created according to the same plan (incidentally, we always agreed with the concept of singling out corrective labor establishments and transferring this service to the Ministry of Justice). And what has happened to the court and the prosecutor's office? Simple arithmetic indicates that the components of law remain in the same usual places.

[Grigoryev] Viktor Pavlovich, you are a professional militiaman and investigating officer, and at quite a young age you passed through all the steps from militia school student to RSFSR minister of internal affairs, USSR minister of internal affairs, and now minister of security and internal affairs... But are you capable of leading such a complex mechanism which has been built into the MSIA by the Russian president's decree—we mean the former services of the ISS and the FSA?

[Barannikov] Thanks for the question, since it enables me to define my credo in the sphere of managing a particular law-enforcement mechanism. It boils down to the following: The minister's tasks are not to direct a specific service or, in this case, counterintelligence. This is inconceivable or, rather, senseless. The minister's task is to ensure efficient work by the leaders of the corresponding services. He is no more than (let us translate this into everyday or economic language) the chairman of a board of directors. And each "sector" must have its own director: director of counterintelligence. Director of the subdivision for combatting organized crime and corruption. Director of criminal investigation, etc.—right down to director of the rear service.

I do not intend to lead either counterintelligence officers or other specialists from the services of the former KGB by the hand. And the members of the commission, for the creation of the MSIA on the chekist side, have already begun to understand this.

[Grigoryev] Nevertheless, it is precisely these people who are concerned about statements by professional militiamen on the elimination of "parallelism..."

[Barannikov] But does parallelism really not exist in a number of cases? Let us see: The militia waged a struggle against organized crime, and the KGB waged a struggle against organized crime. As though two types of organizers of criminal communities are operating in our country. This is absurd! What is the result? Here are some figures: More than 6,000 criminal groups and particularly dangerous criminals relating to the sphere of organized crime are under our militia surveillance in the Russian Federation today. Approximately 1,000 cases are at the stage of being investigated, and approximately 800 have been finished. At the same time the number of analogous criminal cases instituted on the basis of material forwarded from the KGB is 79. Compare: 2,000 and 79. Or again: We speak of the danger of corruption in the system of internal affairs organs. We do not hide the fact that we do not always have high-quality personnel and, of course, we cannot guarantee that all are totally honest. It is necessary to struggle against this. Special subdivisions undoubtedly existed in the KGB to control them. What did they come up with? In mother Russia criminal proceedings were instituted against 384 militia workers for various crimes in the space of 11 months. Of these, 250 cases were based on material from the militia itself and the Russian MVD, and just 31 on KGB material.

[Grigoryev] However, all the press did during the last years of the old KGB leadership was write about incredible raids by chekists to reveal secret stockpiles of food and concealed surpluses in the country and to combat sabotage. Were there any?

[Barannikov] There were. But why, it seems to me, did the KGB get involved in this problem at all? Its leaders simply felt that sooner or later they would be asked for concrete results, for something real done in the state's interests. But what could they reply? Remember the achievements of the "political" main administrations? Or of the Sixth Administration, which "protected" the economy, when what it needed was not protection but fundamental reconstruction. You cannot report back that you have been combatting dissidence in politics and in the economy. And so crime was needed. You remember how Kryuchkov declared a struggle against sabotage, and in the space of 48 hours chekists found huge material assets... in warehouses. Pardon me, but it would be interesting to know where else they might have been. These assets were allegedly hidden by the mafia. People far removed from the problems of crime might have believed that the KGB had thrown all its might into protecting its fellow citizens. But militia professionals were laughing. There are loads of such examples in any internal affairs administration. There is simply a catastrophic lack of time to speak of this from the television screen: We are being overwhelmed by a wave of new crimes. Add to this some juridical "anecdotes," albeit sad ones: The law has still not defined what sabotage or corruption is. What is the mafia? So against what, on the legal and procedural plane, were they fighting?

With regard to the struggle against corruption in the law-enforcement and state sphere. There are no questions here. We are obliged to create our own security service against traitors and corrupt officials.

[Grigoryev] To whom will it be subordinate?

[Barannikov] I would put the question differently: Who will control it? And, in my view, the question must lie in the plane of prosecutor's office supervision.

[Grigoryev] Will there be a political investigation structure in the new MSIA?

[Barannikov] No.

[Grigoryev] What is your attitude to the Russian parliament's statement that a number of "committee" and militia nomenklatura officers with generals' shoulder boards, who assisted the putsch, have gone up in the world?

[Barannikov] I must elaborate: This statement was made in parliament and by members of parliament. I believe that the process of analyzing the primary causes of the putsch and the degree of involvement in it of very different persons will still continue. If the Russian Prosecutor's Office submits specific materials, I will do everything possible to remove them from the law-enforcement system.

IZVESTIYA Observer's Viewpoint

I have long cherished the idea of writing an article about the division of labor between the KGB and the MVD. I have studied historical information on our experience, looked closely at foreign experience, and enlisted the opinions of state security and militia professionals. And I have come up with roughly the following: Just two managerial apparatuses are needed—a department to safeguard external security (both intelligence abroad and counterintelligence inside the country) and a department to safeguard public security (safeguarding of public security and the fight against crime).

True, I did not have time to write about this—I was overtaken by events. There are now two special departments in Russia: Ye. Primakov's intelligence and V. Barannikov's ministry. And it turns out that today I must speak out in favor of the new MSIA. Particularly as the MSIA will, it seems (precisely this is what the chekists fear), break up the former KGB system of agent support. It is worth supporting the president for this alone, if the overseers of our thoughts and feelings (according to specialists, such agents are totally unsuitable for the fight against crime) retire. And it is good that it will be possible to use the KGB's decent technical equipment for the very important business of exposing the mafia. Finally, the merger of the special subdivisions also promises the treasury a saving. Maybe things really will become easier for me, a taxpayer, at some time...

And yet I am opposed to B. Yeltsin's decree. Why? Because, to judge by the first decisions of the architects of the MSIA, it will all boil down to a mechanical merging of two monsters. And this means that political surveillance of us on the part of old KGB agents will remain, expensive special equipment will be scattered among the now numerous corners and offices of the Lubyanka and the Zhitnaya, and the company of those who are dismissed (another question: Whom do they intend to cut back?) will not bring any relief to taxpayers. But, most importantly, there will be no one to continue what Vadim Bakatin began (the destruction of the totalitarian KGB from within). It seems to me that they are today trying to hide the old KGB from the eyes of the public behind the signboard of the MSIA. But tomorrow...

In order that we do not have to fear the horrors of the former NKVD, let us comprehensively sort out the KGB today. Let us give over to the militia that part of its mechanism that is suitable for the fight against crime. Give to intelligence what is capable of working for external security. And consign the rest to the archives of our history.

Barannikov Unveils Crime-Fighting Measures

LD2912122191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1100 GMT 28 Dec 91

[Interview with Viktor Pavlovich Barannikov, Russian minister of security and internal affairs, by All-Union Radio correspondent Andrey Nikiforov from the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow—live]

[Text] [Nikiforov] The various economic reform measures proposed by the Russian Government which are being discussed at the meeting with deputies today includes major packages covering privatization, the reform of the financial system, and social protection for the population.

There is also the very important question of guaranteeing Russia's security during this difficult transition period. It is, naturally, a subject for discussion with Viktor Pavlovich Barannikov, Russia's minister of security and internal affairs. At today's meeting between the government and people's deputies it was said that a special program had been drawn up to guarantee Russia's security in this difficult transition period. I have asked Viktor Pavlovich to give us just the most general outline of this program now. Please, go ahead.

[Barannikov] Thank you. Yes, the Russian Ministry of Security and Internal Affairs has indeed drawn up such a program. The program exists, and an office has been set up at the ministry with instructions to supervise, organize, and carry out these measures.

Let me list the individual measures. Above all, the main task is to protect the population and to prevent various organized crimes, taking into account both the crime situation developing today and the fact that we cannot rule out the possibility of it continuing to increase. What is planned? First, it is planned....[changes thought] These measures have been sent out to all subunits, by which I mean those from both the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the state security branch. It is proposed that they should organize the execution of these measures in conjunction with representatives of the president's administration.

What are the principal measures? Representatives of the Ministry of Security and Internal Affairs will be sent out to the regions most affected by crime to supervise the implementation of the measures and to give practical assistance. Operational investigative groups will also be sent to the worst affected regions to provide practical help on the spot. They are not going out to supervise but to specifically give practical assistance in the fight against crime. Especially in the first month, January, we are planning to send out the strongest possible operational investigative group from the ministry's leadership to give real, practical help on the spot.

[Nikiforov] Viktor Pavlovich, as I understand it these are preventive measures, are they not?

[Barannikov] Yes, they are primarily preventive. It is a whole package of measures. It is planned, above all, to monitor the situation that is developing and to unite forces and resources in good time to avert serious breaches of the law. That is the most important task. That is what is envisioned by these measures.

[Nikiforov] Thank you very much. That was an interview with Viktor Pavlovich Barannikov, Russia's minister of security and internal affairs. Thank you very much.

Communications, Information Agency Created

PM3012151991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Dec 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by Andrey Zhdankin: "Communications Agency Created"]

[Text] A Federal Agency of Government Communications and Information under the president has been created on the basis of the Russian president's government communications committee and several other leading scientific research organizations specializing in the field of the production and development of special equipment and the processing of information.

The agency has been created by analogy with the U.S. National Security Agency. In addition to supplying the top leaders of the republic with all types of scrambled communications, its functions include the development of encoding and encoding apparatus, which are used in the interests of all Russian ministries and departments. So far the department's services are also used by the sovereign states belonging to the former USSR. The agency also engages in the interception and decoding of information. This function is extremely important, because it provides a source of information for the state's top leaders that is independent of the special services.

Lieutenant General Academician Aleksandr Vladimirovich Starovoytov has been appointed general director of the agency.

State Committee for Emergencies Created

925D0065B Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 25 Dec 91 p 3

["RSFSR Presidential Ukase 'On the RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters'"—ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA headline]

[Text] In order to guarantee the activity of the RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters, I **decree**:

1. To charge the RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters with the following:

—coordinating the activity of RSFSR organs of state management to protect the population and national property, and prevent and clean up following emergency situations resulting from accidents, catastrophes, natural disasters, and the use by putative enemies of modern means of destruction;

—insuring the creation of a Russian system to prevent emergency situations and to act when they do occur;

—organizing the development and implementation of state programs aimed at preventing emergency situations, protecting the population from their consequences, and enhancing stability in the functioning of the national economy;

—leadership in work to clean up following major accidents, catastrophes, and natural disasters, and in creating and insuring the readiness of the resources needed for these purposes;

—coordinating work to create state emergency reserve funds of financial, food, medical, and material-technical resources;

—organizing instruction and training of the population for action in emergency situations;

—exercising state supervision over the territory of the RSFSR with respect to compliance with measures to prevent emergency situations and with readiness to act should they occur;

—participating in international cooperation in the field of preventing emergency situations and cleaning up after they occur.

2. To establish for December 1991 a wages fund for workers in the central apparatus of the RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters in the sum of 447,000 rubles, based on a maximum of 470 people in this apparatus, including 120 servicemen from the officer corps of the USSR Ministry of Defense and ranking personnel in the RSFSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

3. To establish that the central apparatus of the RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters is financed through appropriations from the RSFSR state budget allocated for the organs of state management.

4. To grant permission for the RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters to have five deputy chairman, including one first deputy chairman, and a collegium made up of 15 persons.

5. In accordance with the procedure established the RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters will take over from the USSR Ministry of

Defense the management organs, formations, units and subunits, establishments and training establishments (including those of central subordination in accordance with the attached list) of the USSR Civil Defense deployed on the territory of the RSFSR at their status as of 1 December 1991, together with all personnel, weapons, the material-technical base, funds, and budget appropriations allocated to maintain them in 1991.

The RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters will agree with the USSR Ministry of Defense procedure for the transfer of and further support for the above-mentioned subunits.

6. The RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters will set up the following under the committee:

—A headquarters for RSFSR Civil Defense troops to manage civil defense formations and military units and subunits;

—regional centers for civil defense, emergency situations, and cleanup following natural disasters, in the cities of Moscow, St. Petersburg, Rostov-na-Donu, Samara, Yekaterinburg, Novosibirsk, Krasnoyarsk, Chita, and Khabarovsk.

To establish the following maximum numbers of workers:

—for the RSFSR Civil Defense Headquarters: 150, including 100 servicemen;

—for the regional centers (not counting service subunits): 300, including up to 150 servicemen.

The RSFSR Ministry of Economics and Finance together with the RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters will within one month draw up procedure for and volumes of financing for the regional centers and the RSFSR Civil Defense Headquarters.

7. In making a partial change to the RSFSR presidential ukase of 28 November 1991, "On Reorganization of the Central Organs of State Power in the RSFSR," to establish that formation of the RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters is also to be effected by transferring the number of permanent staff and the resources to support them, and also funds and the material-technical base, including administrative buildings and premises and property of the abolished USSR State Commission for Emergency Situations. In this connection, to delete from the appendix to this RSFSR presidential ukase the words "the RSFSR State Committee for Social Protection of Citizens and Rehabilitation of Territories Stricken by the Chernobyl and Other Radiation Catastrophes" and "the USSR State Committee for Emergency Situations."

8. The RSFSR Government will consider questions pertaining to regulation of the work and operational activity of the RSFSR presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters.

9. Within two months the RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters will with the agreement of the RSFSR Ministry of Economics and Finance and the RSFSR Ministry of Justice submit draft provisions on the committee.

10. This ukase enters into force from the moment it is signed.

[Signed] B. Yeltsin, president of the RSFSR
[Dated] Moscow, the Kremlin, 18 December 1991

Appendix to RSFSR presidential ukase No. 305 of 18 December 1991. List of Subunits of the USSR Ministry of Defense (USSR Civil Defense) of Central Subordination Transferred to the RSFSR Presidential State Committee for Civil Defense, Emergency Situations, and Cleanup Following Natural Disasters.

1.151 The USSR Civil Defense Information Center (No. 1 Vatutina Street, Moscow City).

2.630 The USSR Civil Defense All-Union Center for Observation and Laboratory Monitoring (No. 45 Molodogvardeyskaya Street, Moscow city).

3.42 The USSR Civil Defense All-Union Scientific Research Institute, including the institute building under construction at No. 7 Davydkovskaya Street.

4.37 The USSR Civil Defense higher central courses for training leading personnel for the USSR Civil Defense (Novogorsk city, Moscow Oblast).

5.830 The Independent Motorized Battalion (Noginsk city, Moscow Oblast).

6. The USSR Civil Defense Central Command Post (Moscow Oblast, Ruzskiy Rayon).

7.391 The USSR Civil Defense Backup Central Command Post (Bolshaya Filevskaya Street, Moscow City,).

8.626 The USSR Civil Defense Computer Center (Moscow Oblast, Ruzskiy Rayon).

9.138 The USSR Civil Defense Central Laboratory for Measuring Equipment (Novogorsk city, Moscow Oblast).

10.271 The USSR Civil Defense Chief's Independent Control Support Battalion (Bolshaya Filevskaya Street, Moscow City).

11.72 The USSR Civil Defense Central Polyclinic (No. 1 Vatutina Street, Moscow City).

12.495 The USSR Civil Defense headquarters computing and analytical station (Moscow Oblast, Ruzskiy Rayon).

13.688 The USSR Civil Defense Chief's Independent Mobile Control Battalion (Moscow Oblast, Ruzskiy Rayon).

14. The buildings and installations of the headquarters and control of the USSR Civil Defense chief (No. 1 Vatutina Street, Moscow City).

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Holds Session 26-27 Dec

Estonian Treaty Adopted

LD2812110891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 26 Dec 91

[Video report by correspondent V. Tsygankov from 26 December session of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session in Moscow; from the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Excerpts] Today the Russian parliament adopted, after heated debate, the treaty on the principles of interstate relations between the Russian Federation and the Republic of Estonia. [Video: electronic signboard indicates that the vote was 139 for and 24 against, with 30 abstaining] [passage omitted]

Press reports about new public holidays in the Russian Federation have turned out to be premature. The proposed draft has been the target of much censure and criticism. Among other things, the deputies did not go along with the arguments in favor of abolishing such holidays as May Day and 7 November. It was decided to rework the draft, taking into account amendments made by deputies, and to return to it after the January holidays.

Antimonopoly Body Discussed

PM3112160091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Dec 91 p 2

[Aleksandr Shinkin report under the rubric "At the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session": "Debates Continue Unabated"]

[Text] Yesterday the working day at the White House began with a news conference by Russian Vice President A. Rutskoy. He briefed journalists on his working visit to Iran, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. The journalists, however, deviated from this topic and were chiefly interested in A. Rutskoy's opinion on the state of affairs in the country and the situation in the government. The vice president stressed that he did not and does not intend to resign. All his statements are prompted not by personal ambition, as some people think, but by an objective assessment of real life. Apart from anything else, he observed that he has a conscience and remembers his promises to the voters.

While the news conference was going on, the members of the Russian Supreme Soviet, at their regular sitting, were "limbering up" over the agenda. And the majority insisted that the question of merging the law enforcement organs be included. It was decided to discuss it at the evening session.

The discussion of the first item, on the ratification of the Treaty on the Fundamentals of Interstate Relations Between the RSFSR and the Estonian Republic, was not easy. Yes, the deputies thought, the treaty is necessary, but it should be supplemented by bilateral agreements on questions of citizenship, migration, property rights, and culture. As a result the treaty with the Estonian Republic was ratified, but its content was supplemented by a Supreme Soviet resolution recording, so to speak, sensitive points in relations between what are now two states.

During the repeat examination (at Russian President B. Yeltsin's request) of the question of where the Antimonopoly Committee belongs, parliament's "unyielding" nature once again became clear. Boris Nikolayevich, in his letter to the Supreme Soviet, made it clear that the Antimonopoly Committee should form part of the structures of the executive authority, that is, the government. But S. Krasavchenko swept aside all his arguments. Even R. Khasbulatov's attempts to sow some doubts as to the expediency of this committee's being attached to the Supreme Soviet were not successful this time. The vast majority voted for their own earlier decision.

The question of new holidays was also examined. But the draft provoked many disputes. It was decided to send it for further work.

Profit Tax Set at 32%

OW2712212791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1746 GMT 27 Dec 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian parliament has passed a law imposing a 32 percent tax on the profits of enterprises and foreign entities instead of the 35 percent tax suggested by the governnent—and thereby, according to the deputy head of the RSFSR parliament Vladimir Shumeyko, reduced the budget by 24 to 27 billion rubles. The same tax rate (32 percent) will be valid for enterprises fully owned by foreign investors.

Intermediary and trading agencies will be required to pay 45 percent taxes.

Further on Debates

PM0201092392 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Dec 91 pp 1,2

[Aleksandr Shinkin report under the rubric "In the Russian Parliament": "Before the Holidays"]

[Text] The last day before the Christmas holidays was just as busy for the parliamentarians as any other day. So the session's work began as always with "thrashing out" the questions on the agenda.

It used up 30 minutes of valuable time, which was admittedly then more than made up in the lunchbreak.

And when they got down to business, so to speak, the members of the Supreme Soviet seemed to continue with their previous discussion. Turning to Russian General Prosecutor V. Stepankov's application for permission to start criminal proceedings against People's Deputy Achalov, former deputy defense minister, who allegedly took part in the August plot, they rejected this request following a short discussion.

Incidentally, in the evening of the previous sitting, the parliamentarians did not agree with the Russian president's decree "On the Formation of an RSFSR Ministry of Security and Internal Affairs" either, and proposed that B. Yeltsin rescind the part concerning the unification of the Federal Security Agency [FSA] and the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs].

However, this was not the last confrontation with the executive power. During the discussion of the next question on the basic trends in the formation of a Russian Federation budget system for the first quarter of 1992, the president's Decree No. 308 "On the Financing of State Expenditure from the RSFSR Budget in the First Quarter" was also subjected to justifiable criticism, as it had been before.

R. Khasbulatov reported apropos of this that B. Yeltsin himself was indignant when he found out about the content of the decree, because he had not been made aware of it. And Ruslan Imranovich again lectured those who prepare the president's documents.

Having discussed this question, the government was ordered to present by 15 January 1992 the full budget for the first quarter of next year. The law "On Tax on the Profit of Enterprises and Organizations" was also adopted at the afternoon session. A tax on profit will be levied at a rate of 32 percent—45 percent for profits from brokers' offices.

Unfortunately we will only be able to report on the fate of other issues, including changes in the Law on the Press, which was again included in the agenda, in future issues.

Today Russian parliamentarians will have a meeting with the government and they plan to be on holiday until 13 January.

Presidium Meets; Defense Industry Viewed

LD3112115691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2200 GMT 28 Dec 91

[Excerpts] The Presidium of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet convened today in the House of the Soviets. [passage omitted]

Draft laws on conversion of the defense industry in the RSFSR and increased liability for unsanctioned extraction of amber were submitted. After discussion, it was decided to have them examined by the commissions and committees of the chambers, and also at plenary sittings of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet. The Presidium returned for revision a draft agreement on coordinating proposals on demarcation of powers between state bodies of the Russian Federation and its constituent republics. Resolutions on military courts within Russia and on winding up the USSR Supreme Soviet were adopted. A privatization program for state sector and municipal enterprises submitted to the republic's government was examined. The Presidium's members agreed with its main points, and also with the draft of a Russian presidential decree on accelerating privatization. The Presidium issued a resolution winding up its commission on citizenship, pardons, and state awards. [passage omitted]

The Russian Supreme Soviet has now gone into recess for the next two weeks, during which time parliamentarians will conduct constituency work.

Zhirinovskiy Charges Commission With 'Slander'

PM0101150992 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Dec 91 p 2

[A. Arkhipov report: "Liberal Democratic Party Leader Comes Out Against Slander. On Behalf of the Honest and the Poor"]

[Text] Vladimir Zhirinovskiy has evaluated the latest statements by the official authorities as "another slander campaign," mounted this time by the deputies' commission of the Russian Supreme Soviet and taken up by the general prosecutor. He interrupted his vacation and summoned journalists to the headquarters of the LDP [Liberal Democratic Party] yesterday.

Replying to a claim by a member of the deputies' commission in the "White House" that the LDP "virtually does not exist," the party's leader mentioned that it now has more than 70,000 members in its ranks. There are primary organizations throughout the territory of the USSR.

There are honest and poor people in our party, its leader emphasized. They have little money. For registration everywhere the LDP will need millions, which it does not yet have. The party's membership, submitted for registration to the Union Ministry of Justice, stood at 12,000—which is many times in excess of any requirements.

In this connection Zhirinovskiy asked: Where is the recorded membership of "Democratic Russia," which is now in power?

Speaking ironically about "the fabrications of an ex-colonel of the KGB," Zhirinovskiy remarked: But did the former chekist himself not sully himself by meeting with...himself? To be serious, I have met with the country's entire former political leadership: Ryzhkov, Yazov, and many others. I officially warned of the danger of the country's dismemberment and of a coming civil war. As the leader of a political party, I had to meet also with the director of the Sandunovskiye Baths, which Mayor Popov agreed to sell. I met officially with Kryuchkov and expounded to him my view of the situation and the country's prospects.

It was evidently on this that the retired KGB colonel based his fabrications. Incidentally, I asked all the top leaders for assistance in allocating premises for the party's headquarters. There are such letters in the archives of Gorbachev, Yeltsin, and Popov. Yanayev had my letter, because Gorbachev had handed my case over to Yanayev before going on vacation in August.

The LDP leader, a lawyer by training, reported that he intends to institute criminal proceedings on a case of malicious slander.

Political & Social

Yeltsin Issues 'Urgent' Land Reform Decree

CM0101202792 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA First Edition in Russian 31 Jan 92 p 3

["Decree of the President of the Russian Federation 'On Urgent Measures To Implement Land Reform in the RSFSR'"]

[Text] In order to improve land relations, privatize land and simplify the procedure for assigning plots of land to individual citizens, I **decree** that:

1. State-owned and municipal land should be privatized in accordance with existing legislation and this decree.

2. Decisions on redistribution of land should be taken by local administration bodies at recommendations of land reform and land resources committees.

3. The collective and state farms should in 1992 carry out their reorganization and bring their status in line with the RSFSR law "On Enterprises and Entrepreneurship" and should re-register themselves with the appropriate bodies.

Local executive bodies should supervise the exercise of the right of collective farm members and personnel of state enterprises to freely leave farms and enterprises to set up peasant (individual) farms.

4. The Councils of Ministers of the constituent republics of the RSFSR, the executive bodies of the territories, regions and autonomous units should before February 1, 1992 determine the maximum size of plots of land to be allocated to peasant (individual) farms, depending on their specialization, number of personnel employed, the quality of land, and other factors, unless such size will have been determined by the appropriate councils of people's deputies.

The district executive bodies should, together with land reform and land resources committees, determine average district norms of land to be placed in individual citizens' ownership free, with due account taken of the quality of land.

5. Plots of land remaining after free land has been handed over to personnel of collective farms and other cooperative agricultural enterprises, as well as to joint stock companies, including those set up on the basis of state agricultural enterprises, should be included in land redistribution funds.

Local administration should organize the sale of fund lands on a competitive basis and their leasing out with the right of subsequent purchase. In organizing competitive bidding and leasing, the preferential rights should be given to citizens who previously used the plots of land concerned on a lease, members of work collectives quitting a collective or state farm with the purpose of establishing a peasant (individual) farm, and also to other workers on these farms. Land left undistributed should be handed over, or sold at a normative price, and given several bidders—at auctions, to individual citizens and legal entities.

6. The personnel of state farms and other agricultural enterprises, collective farms and cooperatives using their land by right of indefinite (constant) tenure should, before March 1, 1992, decide on transition to private, collective-shared or other forms of ownership, in accordance with the Land Code of the RSFSR. The local administration should ensure the issue to citizens who have become owners of land the appropriate certificates on the right to own land, which should be valid until the documents certifying that right are issued.

7. To simplify the procedure for handing plots of land over to collective and state farm workers who intend to set up their own farms, all agricultural institutions (except experimental and research farms) should determine stretches of land to be handed over to peasant farms in the first place.

8. Farm managers should be obliged, within one month of receiving an application to establish a peasant (individual) farm, to apportion land to the farmer and members of his family in kind. The apportioned plot of land should be registered by the local administration in accordance with existing legislation. A property share should be allocated simultaneously with the land share. In case of a delay in the allocation of land and a property share, a fine should be imposed on farm managers by local

bodies of the land reform and land resources committee of the Ministry of Agriculture of the RSFSR, amounting to three monthly salaries.

9. Citizens withdrawing from collective and state farms should have the right to exchange their land and property shares with others, and also to lease them out.

10. Peasant farms should be given the right to mortgage land with banks. Banks should be allowed to issue credits on mortgaged land.

11. The Ministry of Agriculture of the RSFSR and the Ministry of Economics and Finance of the RSFSR should draft and submit to the RSFSR Government before February 1, 1992 proposals on the procedure for determining the price of plots of land when sold or bought by local administration bodies, and also when mortgaged with a bank.

12. Citizens owning plots of land as their property should be allowed, from January 1, 1992, to sell them to other citizens and have the deeds registered with the local administration in the following cases:

When retiring on a pension;
When receiving land by way of inheritance;
When resettling with the aim of establishing a peasant farm on free lands of the redistribution fund;
When investing the sum realized from the sale of land in processing, trading, building and service enterprises in the countryside.

Other transactions for the purchase and sale of land plots not provided for by legislation and this decree shall be invalid.

13. Personnel of agricultural enterprises who have plots of land or land shares (stocks) should be allowed to sell them to other personnel of the farm, or to the farm, at free prices.

14. Plots of land allocated for subsidiary smallholdings, gardening, or housing construction in the countryside should be placed in citizens' ownership free of charge. The bodies of the land reform and land resources committee of the Ministry of Agriculture of the RSFSR should ensure in 1992 the issue of title deeds to such plots of land.

15. It should be stipulated that with permission of the Government of the RSFSR land may be set aside for a peasant (individual) farm, fruit and vegetable growing, and individual housing construction in first-group forests not of nature—protection, recreational, historical or cultural value. In agreement with forestry bodies peasant (individual) farms should be allocated forest lands for the comprehensive use in agriculture and forestry in accordance with the requirements of forest legislation.

16. The land reform and land resources committee of the Ministry of Agriculture of the RSFSR should regularly draw up catalogues of lands available from the redistribution fund, publish them, carry advertising in mass media, and help with resettlement of individual citizens willing and able to set up peasant farms.

17. The land reform and land resources committee of the Ministry of Agriculture of the RSFSR and its local bodies should bring to justice those violating land legislation, and committing red tape and abuses when solving questions of the land reform in accordance with Article 125 of the Land Code of the RSFSR.

The land reform and land resources committees of the constituent republics of the RSFSR, the territories, regions, autonomous region, and autonomous areas should be granted the right to suspend unlawful decisions taken by district and city (except Moscow and St. Petersburg) local administrative bodies—and the district and city land reform and land resources committees, by rural and township administrative bodies—with regard to the withdrawal and granting of land pending the examination of such decisions by the appropriate bodies.

18. The Councils of Ministers of the constituent republics of the RSFSR, heads of administration in the territories, regions, autonomous region, and autonomous areas should be recommended to set up public councils for land reforms at land reform and land resources committees, with the participation of local branches of social organisations and peasant self-government bodies to draft and submit proposals on questions of the land reform to the local administration and representatives of the president of the RSFSR.

19. The bodies of the prosecutor's office of the RSFSR should within three months appeal against normative acts and rulings taken by economic executives contradicting existing legislation and this decree.

20. Supervision over the fulfilment of this decree shall be vested with the Ministry of Agriculture of the RSFSR and the supervisory board of the RSFSR President Administration. Progress in the fulfilment of the decree should be reported monthly.

21. The decree shall come into force from the moment of its adoption. Points 8 and 12 shall come into effect in the manner established by the November 1, 1991 resolution of the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR "On Legal Support for the Economic Reform".

[Signed] President of the Russian Federation Boris Yeltsin

[Dated] Moscow, the Kremlin, December 27, 1991

Individual Farms Exceed 40,000

LD0201114992 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0900 GMT 2 Jan 92

[Text] The total number of individual farms in Russia has exceeded 40,000. President Boris Yeltsin issued late last month a decree designed to stimulate such a form of farming. It gives all those wishing to leave collective farms the right to get a plot of land free, and work on it independently. As sociological studies show, individual farmers work two to three times more effectively than members of agricultural cooperatives.

Yeltsin Issues Decree on Foreign Ministry

PM0201092992 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Dec 91 First Edition p 1

[Decree of the president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic "On the RSFSR Foreign Policy Service," signed in the Kremlin on 18 December 1991 by RSFSR President B. Yeltsin]

[Text] In connection with the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's ratification of the Agreement on Creating a Commonwealth of Independent States of 8 December 1991 I resolve:

1. That the RSFSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs will:

assume control and operational management of the abolished USSR Ministry of Foreign Relations, including buildings, installations, property and resources, and training establishments and institutions and economic facilities administered by it, as well as embassies, consulates, and other missions abroad;

present within one month the RSFSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs' new organizational structure and establishment and proposals on the rational utilization of the abolished ministry's staffers;

hold talks within one month with the Commonwealth's member-states and other sovereign states formerly union republics of the USSR on creating common coordinating and consultative mechanisms to effect foreign policy activity;

draft a temporary directive on the Russian diplomatic service before 1 January 1992;

create a State Protocol Service ensuring uniform protocol practice in the RSFSR.

2. That the RSFSR Ministry of the Economy and Finance, before completion of the process of agreeing and determining questions of the shared funding of the former USSR Ministry of External Relations' system of institutions abroad, will make provision with the participation of sovereign states for the expenses of institutions abroad to be met from the RSFSR budget.

[Signed] RSFSR President B. Yeltsin
[Dated] Moscow, the Kremlin
18 December 1991

Rutskoy Criticizes Government for 'Inactivity'

LD0201111892 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1003 GMT 2 Jan 92

[By TASS correspondent Georgiy Mikhailin]

[Text] Paris, 2 Jan (TASS)—"I criticize the Russian Government for its inactivity. But this in no way means that I am acting against the president. We must govern the country at all costs, because it is in a state of deep crisis," Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy stated in an interview published in the weekly PARIS-MATCH on Wednesday [1 January].

Rutskoy expressed disagreement with the majority of the members of the government who, in his opinion, see their current role in "setting the national economy right, and not in managing it." The vice president did not support price liberalization, either, because, he believes, the Russian economy is still being monopolized, and the distribution and taxation systems have not been developed. The government, like its predecessors, the vice president said, has once again "embarked on a path of doing things on a giant scale [gigantomania] and cutting itself off from realities." According to Rutskoy, the technocrats ought to try and live on a minimum monthly salary of 342 rubles.

Russia will scarcely be able to ovecome the crisis by the middle of this year, the vice president noted. "We need to carry out the reforms in stages and appoint specific people responsible for them. Instead of that, we are dealing with intrigues which are being directed by people who are only concerned with the distribution of power."

Rutskoy emphasized that there can be no question of his directing any opposition to the president, and that he would be going along with Yeltsin "to the final triumph." However, in his opinion, the president is making a mistake by entrusting so much to Gennadiy Burbulis, first deputy prime minister of the Russian Government, who, the vice president believes, by actually heading the government, is acting according to the "divide and conquer" method. Nevertheless, Rutskoy does not see any "particular threat" in this, because the leaders elected by the people "always can replace the executives they have appointed if the latter pursue their own objectives which are different from those of the country."

At the current extremely complex stage of the transition from dictatorship to democracy, Russia needs a very strong executive power which, however, must be kept in check by a democratic opposition, the vice president stressed. It is at the development stage, and it must be assisted in its formation as quickly as possible. The Democratic Reform Movement can play the role of one of the counterbalances of executive power, Rutskoy concluded.

Khasbulatov Reflects on 1991, 1992 Prospects

LD2912151191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1300 GMT 29 Dec 91

["Exclusive" interview with Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, by Vladimir Perfilyev; place and date not given; from the "Television News Service" program—recorded]

[Text] [Perfilyev] Ruslan Imranovich, it has become a tradition on the eve of the New Year to remember the days that have passed, the year that has passed, and what it was like for Russia. In your opinion, what were the main landmarks?

[Khasbulatov] Well, the characteristic feature of the beginning of the year consisted of the fact that we effectively had no power at all. I remember how Anatoliy Sobchak, speaking at the Supreme Soviet, used a phrase which cut me to the quick. He said that the power of the Supreme Soviet was only real in the White House here in Moscow.

Well, however bitter, this was partially true at the time. That was the time when we were very urgently seeking—both from Gorbachev, who was president at the time, and from the central government—a certain understanding on a sufficiently clear-cut sharing, a sharing of responsibility between the country and Russia. We were saying that we would like to lead Russia within a new, renewed Union, according to the will of our people, our peoples, the Russian peoples, and we would be helping you to rule our whole enormous country.

We met with no understanding. Unfortunately we met with no understanding and in the final account, as you can see, our Soviet Union has now broken up. I am from the group of people who are far from rejoicing over this. Life is life, and this is life. Now the Russian state has no other authority except for Russia's Supreme Soviet, elected according to the demonstration of the will of its peoples, and an elected president, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. These are, so to speak, the two legs on which our authority today is standing.

[Perfilyev] We need a certain amount of trust from the people for the parliament and the government which, objectively speaking, has been lost in recent times...

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] You see, of course we need trust. First and foremost we need trust. Yes, we need trust; trust is what we need. Together with the president, we would like all the forces—regardless of the personal or ideological views we may all have—all our public forces, all our people, to understand one simple truth: We will not achieve anything if we do not try to overcome our misfortunes together.

I personally believe that there should be very broad consolidation of forces, a united force, a coalition of all the democratic forces. Social forces are most often democratic forces because they draw nourishment from the views of the people, the mood of the people. Of course the last thing we want to do now is to go around hounding people who hold other views and so on. At this time the realization of the danger to the homeland and the people itself must somehow, you know, be embodied at least in the instinct of self-preservation for our society, our state. That is the first thing.

Now, regarding the second thing you said: I do not altogether agree that the Russian parliament is losing so much prestige. I believe—and quite frankly, this is confirmed in fact by research—that the people are gaining a stronger understanding that even this fragile equilibrium we have actually rests, at the present time, on two sources of power, you could say, of government; in other words, two authorities: the president and the Supreme Soviet.

Why? Because without a strong Supreme Soviet, presidential power is, as it were, ephemeral. It could very quickly go out of existence.

[Perfilyev] That is, some sort of restraining...

[Khasbultov, interrupting] Yes, but at the same time the Supreme Soviet cannot be strong unless there is a strong presidential power. There will be no harm in it if the Supreme Soviet passes a law and the president does not approve it, vetoes it, and sends it back; no harm at all, no crisis of any kind. It will not be the end of the world either if the Supreme Soviet does not approve some decree passed at the Kremlin.

[Perfilyev] As has indeed happened.

[Khasbulatov] It is the norm. It is the norm, as it should be. Otherwise what sort of power is it? Should we go back to the old business of just putting our hands up and voting; what the president says goes, and the Supreme Soviet just ratifies it? I think those times have passed.

[Perfilyev] What has been the brightest day of your life this year? What do you remember?

[Khasbulatov] You know, I remember many days, I remember many, and say, 19 August, that was an unforgettable day. And the huge meeting in Free Russia Square. And I remember 22 August. Of course I also remember the days of the last Congress, when I was elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet. I remember them, but I would not say... [changes thought] Recalling it now, I am less and less pleased about that event, frankly, because I somehow feel with every passing day the enormous responsibility that is building up.

Of course, not everything is possible. A great deal is not possible. Therefore, to consider that I am somehow satisfied with my work, totally satisfied with the Supreme Soviet and with my colleagues—I am far from such an impression, you know. No one can feel such self-satisfaction at the moment. But I think the criticism which comes daily from letters and from the media, it is....[changes thought] To react to it, so, I am being insulted, I am being criticized—one has to reach conclusions from this and realize that it is not the good life which is making them criticize me.

[Perfilyev] As a journalist I can say that in some cases you have demonstrated your will and, fortunately for us, defended the provisions of the press law which basically preserve the democratic principles for the press. I think this happened yesterday.

[Khasbulatov] Yes, you saw. Well, you see, that was a case in which it was somehow possible, and I think I played a role here somehow. I managed to convince the deputies that we have to give freedom to journalists at least. Let them engage in that business. There is a lot which I do not like, but I am not the embodiment of an ideal. It would, therefore, have been very bad if the Supreme Soviet had basically preserved those quite harsh, discriminatory provisions. In this case they listened. I am grateful to the deputies; they listened to my opinion and the authority of other persons, and now I hope you will not criticize the Russian Supreme Soviet.

[Perfilyev] We will!

[Khasbulatov] How could you?! [laughs]

[Perfilyev] Ruslan Imranovich, from the perspective of the chairman of the republican parliament, from the angle of this White House, how do you see the destiny of the Russians, the destiny of our towns and villages in the coming year?

[Khasbulatov] You know, just because I may say slightly sad things does not at all mean that I am somehow inclined to be pessimistic. Of course not. If I did not believe in our good destiny, if I was not sure of the destiny of our people, I would not be involved in this business. I think we have now embarked on a very decisive trend in the direction of realizing major transformations in our society. We have, moreover, opportunities.

We will not permit any hunger, first of all, even if our allies or enemies are talking about this. Russia and the Russian people are not threatened by hunger. Of course there will be disruptions, for instance, in heating. In individual cases, of course, there will be disruptions with some foodstuffs, but it is ridiculous to say that people should lay in for hunger and brace themselves for it. This is simply impossible. We will not permit it.

Anyway, it must not be forgotten that the Russian state has existed for 1,000 years and that it has experienced and overcome such difficult periods many times in the history of this state and its peoples. We will overcome them again this time by depending on our own people and by having the support of the people. If we really take into account the opinions of the people—respect them and act in accordance with the views of the people—I am absolutely sure that we will overcome all the problems, no matter how grave.

[Perfilyev] I wish very much that your optimism could be conveyed to our viewers and that they, after all, might enter the New Year in hope.

[Khasbulatov] I think there is every reason for this. I appeal to our citizens to believe in us, in the Supreme Soviet and in the president of Russia. Indeed, we really depend only on our people. We have no other support. We are indeed trying to do everything possible for the good of our people and our fellow citizens.

Khasbulatov on Changes, Yeltsin Role

LD3112191291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1600 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Interview with Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov to Oleg Poptsov, chairman of the All-Russian Television and Radio Company in Moscow on 31 December—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Poptsov] We are approaching the end of the year. The year has been a difficult one and even now in defining this year it is difficult to say what was more difficult—its beginning, its middle, or its end. Looking back, I would like to put this question to you as Supreme Soviet chairman, as someone who takes his place every day and starts by saying comrade deputies, please take your seats, please register your presence: This year what do you see in the parliament's activity—or for yourself personally—as being success and what do you recall with bitterness?

[Khasbulatov] First and foremost, of course, I remember with bitter feelings those wasted months of fruitless discussions in attempts to convince each other—for example, practically the whole year was spent in totally fruitless attempts to convince former President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev of the fact that unfortunately whether we like it or not the realities are such and clearly that we have to build our relations with the republics and states in a somewhat different way. I am absolutely sure that had there been such an understanding at the central level at that time then we would probably not have been enduring such a great misfortune today.

I have to say that I certainly do not take any pleasure in the Soviet Union's disintegration. Whether this union was indeed bad or whether it was good, it was our Union, it was our country. But what can one do about it? Life is like that. Life has arranged things in such a way that the Russian state today is an absolutely independent state. Consequently—and here I would like to get right back to our subject—the Russian parliament, the Supreme Soviet of Russia, of the Russian Federation—the official name of the RSFSR which was changed by the Supreme Soviet a few days ago in complete conformity with the Constitution, may it be said—now possesses complete authority, legislative authority, in our country. In the past, you know, when there was the Union parliament and the Union president and when somehow or other they proceeded on the basis that there could be mistakes on our part and that they would correct them there, that we are not fully responsible for the state of the country, that we are limited...

[Poptsov, interrupting] That you might play at being the opposition.

[Khasbulatov] That we might play at being the opposition, well now that feeling must of course go away completely, it must disappear completely. We have talked about this with our deputies, but it seems to me that far from all of them have yet been reached by complete understanding of this new quality of the Russian deputy—far from all of them yet. Although I have to say that, of course, our parliament has completely matured. It has almost become professional. We are completely in tune with one another and have responsibility for very grave issues. Quite simply, I take pride in the fact that our deputies support their chairmen. Instances when our opinions diverge are very rare. The quality is quite different. There's no one looking over us. There is the president, leading executive power and there is parliament, balanced forces, each of which must of course back up the force, authority, and correctness of the decisions being taken by the other. For the existence of presidential power is inconceivable without serious parliamentary power and naturally, parliament cannot exist without a normal presidency which is strong, confident, and authoritative. [passage omitted]

[Poptsov] Ruslan Imranovich, there is a great deal of argument on this subject, and I think that many times either the president, for his part, or you, for your part, or members of government, have been trying to convince society and themselves that there is absolute unity. Although it is perhaps normal—and in this regard I would agree with the president—that certain problems must cause controversies. [passage omitted] Which problems do you feel are being resolved and which problems are still splitting society?

[Khasbulatov] [passage omitted] The thing is that certain issues are strategic. They come under the parliament's jurisdiction, either of the Supreme Soviet or of the Congress. [passage omitted] But since our people are not used to this system of interaction and work, some of the ignorant ones are usually raising unhealthy racket about it. As to relations between the president and the Supreme Soviet, there are no problems here. For this has now become a custom: Boris Nikolayevich used to be Supreme Soviet chairman himself. I used to be his first deputy. Of course, when I was his first deputy, nobody outside knew then on what terms we were and how we worked together. But I think he said on several occasions that he worked well with Khasbulatov since the latter always had an opinion of his own. Now we work well together, too, and we always reach agreement. But you see, I do not want to criticize anyone here. The government is placed between the Supreme Soviet and the president, and that is a very important factor. If the government is professionally competent and knows its business well, it must be engaged in handling its own affairs as required by its professionalism. For instance, economic management, organization of our business but not of policies. In the government there must not be any policymakers. And the claims of some government members to some sort of political leadership only lead to political squabbling. Once again I just very much admire the president who has begun to understand this increasingly better. If one has become part of a government team, one must be involved in managing one's own specific section of work, and must forget all about politics.

[Poptsov] But let us be sufficiently fair, Ruslan Imranovich. Sometimes the Supreme Soviet, too, is trying to set up parallel structures for economic problems and so on, to an extent claiming for itself the government's right to act.

[Khasbulatov] You see, I do not wish to hide from you that, if say the Supreme Soviet sees that the government fails to cope with its tasks, then naturally we would not be able to turn a blind eye to this. We will start interfering more actively in the affairs of the executive power. I do not wish to conceal this.

We will intervene more vigorously in executive matters. I do not want to hide this. We cannot afford dissatisfied people because we are playing at democracy here.

[Poptsov] But I think that one should not apportion blame here—who is to blame most, if we ...

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] Yes, let's not apportion blame. Accountable to the people are two institutions: the Supreme Soviet and the president. No one else is accountable to the people. The government is accountable to the president and not to the people. Therefore, both the president and the Supreme Soviet can dismiss the government or any member of it. It is this we are talking about: that accountable to the people are the deputies. [passage omitted]

We will not permit the government to attempt to escape our clutches. I am saying this quite openly. You know—I have to tell you—we are not trying to be a substitute for it, not in any case. You have seen this. Look, virtually every draft law in the past two to three weeks at this difficult time we have been helping through, we have been helping it along, we have really been helping. In those instances when it seems to us that a draft law is feeble, we have been helping. We have many professionals: among the deputies, in the committees, the advisers in the Supreme Economic Council. For all intents and purpose, now—you know—the entire scientific intelligentsia is going to the Supreme Soviet. Our Russian scientific intelligentsia tells us: We are ready to help you. The institutes are going there, those directly engaged in production are going there, directors of enterprises are going there. They tell us: We are ready to help you. And, we are helping the government bring the draft laws up to scratch, we are not blocking them, we are not trying to pick hairs. We really want interaction, mutual understanding. This was our advice. In particular, we ... [changes thought] I asked Boris Nikolayevich and he, indeed, somehow recommended to his government that it should associate more frequently with our deputies and explain things to them.

[Poptsov] I think that now such contact has been established and this is very important. Now, I would, this is not even a question, but to conclude: We are at the end of the year—the year is drawing to a close. So then, what would you tell your voters?

[Khasbulatov] Oh! What would I say?

[Poptsov] Well, what would the voters appreciate already?

[Khasbulatov] Yes, yes [word indistinct]. I would like to tell our voters that I very well understand the grave situation, all these adversities, all major annoyances which they have in their lives to date, all this shortage of food, goods. I know that many are suffering because they are unable to give their children a start—pensioners, disabled people, servicemen. I assure you that we see all this. Every day I meet people. I read hundreds of letters. I talk to our officials in oblasts and krays, in our Russian republics. I assure you that we will indeed try to do everything in order to alleviate this grave situation.

What else am I to say now? Frankly speaking, I would like somehow to ask my fellow citizens' pardon for the fact that so far we have not improved their situation. Speaking frankly, I do feel personally culpable in this matter. I am trying somehow to compensate, and to be honest I've already almost exhausted the deputies, and our apparatus is working night and day. We are trying to strengthen this economic base in order to help our people somewhat. All in all, I'll be doing all I can to improve the situation, and not in some far-off future. I believe in our reforms, I believe in our president, I believe in our parliament. I know that we in the Commonwealth have good cooperation, it is coming off. I am saying that we are doing a great deal to improve the situation of our people.

[Poptsov] [passage omitted]

Burbulis Comments on Nuclear Weapons Control

LD2912212691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1015 GMT 29 Dec 91

[By TASS correspondent Gennadiy Petrov]

[Text] Lisbon, 29 December (TASS)—Gennadiy Burbulis, first deputy prime minister of Russia, thinks that 1992 should become a year of the survival and revival of Russia. He stated this in an exclusive interview for the Portuguese newspaper PUBLICA.

In his view, it is natural that Russia aspires to take the USSR's place in the UN Security Council. Russia is taking on responsibility for the USSR's obligations to the world community and we give this official recognition, he noted. Among the documents signed at the meeting of heads of 11 republics in Alma-Ata, I would single out in particular the agreement of four states, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russia, and Ukraine, which hold nuclear weapons, G. Burbulis continued. The content of this document is global in nature, as these states have confirmed Russia's legal continuity as the main holder of nuclear weapons and as the guarantor of our nuclear policy. Belarus and Ukraine have once again confirmed their intention to press for the status of non-nuclear states. As for Kazakhstan, it is close to this position, and the elimination of strategic weapons on its territory is a question of time. The nuclear button is in Russia's hands, and that is the most important thing.

On the former Union's Armed Forces, G. Burbulis stated that this issue will be addressed on 30 December at the council of heads of state in Minsk. We advocate the conclusion of a treaty on a defense alliance and the creation of a defense council. It is proposed to create united strategic armed forces which will include the actual strategic forces, and also the air force and the navy. This plan is realistic, especially taking into account the agreement of the four, which makes provision for rules insuring single control of nuclear weapons and a single policy regarding accords on their reduction. We are not only ready to carry out the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on strategic offensive weapons, but also to propose a more far-reaching and somewhat different system of cutting nuclear arms. We discussed this with George Bush and we found support.

Asked whether there has been any further change in the date for freeing prices following the Alma-Ata meeting, G. Burbulis replied in the negative. He said this will happen on 2 January. Even as it is, many difficulties have arisen because prices were not freed on 16 December, as had been planned. After the declaration of free prices, goods and consumers must find one another. At first prices will be raised excessively, then they will bed themselves in. For the first week and a half people will go to the shops as if to museums or exhibition halls, to gape at the price-lists. There will even be anger and fear, which is inevitable. But if we have decided to switch to the market, we need precision and resolve, courage and responsibility. We are ready to undertake this.

Speaking of the government's main task, G. Burbulis recalled: We ourselves have taken the title "team of reforms," and we are tied to their destiny. We have completed work on the budgetary guidelines for 1992 and on the budget for the first quarter. This blueprint will be presented to the Supreme Soviet. The formation of a fully fledged, real budget is now a hopeless task because we are operating in extreme conditions. But the main thing is that we are taking a course toward reform, which anticipates certain demands on the budget. It is only possible to insure stabilization with a deficit- free budget.

According to G. Burbulis, there are no contradictions between reduction in expenditure and promises to insure social protection. We do not conceal, he said, our methods for insuring incomes—strict tax policy, the basic principles of which have been adopted by the Supreme Soviet. Social protection is intended to be targetted and quite specific. But we cannot promise social assistance to everyone. We do not have the means to increase allocations for education, health care and culture. All we can do is to maintain expenditure at the current year's level. Military expenditure and subsidized spheres, in particular agriculture, are substantially reduced. We see social protection as practical actions for pensioners, students, and the indigent, who will be in most difficulty before summer.

In response to a question on whether the government is sure of its strength, and what it relies on, G. Burbulis said: "On being understood and supported, and on the people working with us. In any case, we hope so. But there are considerable forces, including Russian ones, which want us to fail. But, I think that nonetheless there are more people who understand that we cannot go on living like this any longer, in a rich country which has ruined itself by its stupidity. The year 1992 must be the year of our survival and revival."

Zhirinovskiy Refutes Claims of KGB Ties

LD2812031891 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT 27 Dec 91

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Palariya]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, chairman of the Liberal-Democratic Party, described claims about his cooperation with the KGB as "slanderous accusations."

He is also against allegations his party has not been properly registered, as members of the Russian Supreme Soviet's commission on the investigation of the coup's reasons put it.

Speaking today at the party's headquarters, Zhirinovskiy noted the Liberal-Democratic Party had been properly registered at the Soviet Ministry of Justice on April 12, 1991.

Touching on his alleged cooperation with the KGB, Zhirinovskiy showed correspondents a document of August 28 signed by Vadim Bakatin, which certifies he "has never been a secret service agent and never cooperated with them."

At the same time, the Liberal-Democratic Party leader demanded that all the secret service archives be immediately open, as, in his opinion, they may reveal information about "half of the Democratic Russia leaders'" cooperation with the KGB.

Zhirinovskiy stressed his party is not interested in confrontation with the Russian authorities. "We want to live in a country without civil wars, starvation or confrontation," he noted.

Democratic Russia Appoints Political Council

LD2912061791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2030 GMT 28 Dec 91

[Text] Moscow, 28 Dec (TASS)—The Democratic Party of Russia [DPR] now has its own "Politburo"—a 12-man Political Council [politsovet, politicheskiy sovet] was elected at a session of the party's board today. Nikolay Travkin, leader of the DPR, was entrusted with carrying out the duties of chairman of the Political Council.

Officials Elected

LD0101070792 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1900 GMT 29 Dec 91

[Text] The Democratic Party of Russia [DPR] has a 12-man Political Council [politsovet, politicheskiy sovet] elected at a session of the party's board today.

Nikolay Travkin, leader of the DPR, was entrusted with carrying out the duties of chairman of the Political Council. Yevgeniy Malkin was elected deputy chairman. The DPR press center reports that the board discussed the situation that has evolved after the meeting which was held in Manezhnaya Ploshchad on 10 December and which was negatively assessed by a number of newspapers. In the opinion of the DPR board, this happened because contemptible political forces took part in this meeting. The leadership of the DPR had no plans to consolidate with such forces. The board considered that the presence of these forces at the meeting was a tactical mistake.

Research Center Forecasts Disintegration

LD3112184291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1600 GMT 31 Dec 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] We continue this last TSN program for the year. In the second part of the program: What awaits Russia in the new year, a nonastrological forecast; festive exchanges of pleasantries in bread lines; sports, and the sport developing fastest is "shaping." [video shows, over beat music, scuffles in shop lines, a model slipping off a fur coat]

In the year ahead, the same fate awaits Russia as befell the former Soviet Union: The Federation will disintegrate into at least 12 semi-states, with the prospect of a Russian Commonwealth being set up. Such is the scientific conclusion reached by the Moscow Center for Socio-Strategic Research, under the direction of Dr. Anatoliy Antonov. We could be talking about the creation of a Far East Republic, Yakut Republic, Yenisey-Baykal Republic, Siberian Republic, Khanty-Mansiysk Republic, Yamal-Nenets Republic, Urals Republic, Republic of Tatarstan, Republic of Bashkortostan, Volga Republic, North Caucasus Republic, Northwestern Republic, Central Russian Republic—that's 12 [as heard]. So, upon what does the center base its conclusion, then? Over to Anatoliy Antonov:

[Begin recording] [A.N.Antonov, director of the Center for Socio-Strategic Research] The fact is that the process of disintegration of the Union has not been halted, and Russia in its present form represents a part of the former Union. Economic and natural regions exist that are striving to give their self-sufficiency political form. If this is impeded, then there will be bloodshed, but if it is assisted, then we can expect the economy to really take off. [end recording]

[Kiselev] Up to now, at least, the center's forecasts, unlike astrological forecasts, have been accurate, but we will wait for all that next year.

Continuation of Space Program Discussed

PM3112152791 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1200 GMT 27 Dec 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast: Report by M. Ponomarev and N. Rostova]

[Text] [Ponomarev] The disintegration of the Union has merely underscored the need for reforms in the sphere of space exploration. In our country the main problem of this sector lies in its unprofitability. For reasons that are known, the Soviet space program was from the outset and essentially remains to this day a purely military program. The civilian part of this sector was developed extremely slowly and unwillingly. In contrast with the Western space program, whose superachievements were immediately put in the service of the economy, our country pursued the mad dream of military superiority in space. Here is just one example to illustrate what this has resulted in—a U.S. satellite weighing 800 kg ensures communications via several thousand channels. Our satellite weighing 4.5 tonnes has only four communication channels.

This is beginning to change now, but in order to save the situation the space program needs 7 billion rubles. After 2 January this sum will automatically increase more than fivefold.

Should we be talking about this sort of expenditure when store shelves are empty? We should. Unless we save our space program and make it serve the interests of the people, scientists are warning that we may fall behind world standards irretrievably in a matter of two to three years. And then we will have to pay a hundred-fold, and in dollars, for meteorological surveys, communications, television, and many other things.

The life saver of our space program is to be the Russian Space Agency. A draft for the establishment of this agency has been elaborated by a Russian Government working group. It is envisaged that similar agencies of other members of the Commonwealth of Independent States will join up with the Russian agency. World experience has shown that sensible funding of space programs is the best and shortest way to develop all the sectors of the national economy, and thus to enhance society's prosperity, which is of utmost importance for us today.

Media

Further on Yeltsin's Meeting With Media

92UN0548A Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Dec 91 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Media Can Breathe Easier After the Meeting With President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin"]

[Text] While the majority of the population of the former USSR awaits—some with fear, some with hope—the beginning of the economic reforms announced by the leaders of the new commonwealth states, newspaper, television, and other mass media professionals do not entertain any illusions since they have long been operating under the "market press." It is impossible to call it a civilized market, since we deal with the same state monopolists represented by paper-makers, postal and transportation services, and printers... The results of "contract" relations between the press and its partners are well known: Many newspapers and magazines will have to either declare bankruptcy or raise prices on their output so much that it may become no longer affordable for the reader—unless, of course, he is a millionaire...

The search for a solution to the existing situation was continued by the participants in the Russian conference of editors of all- Russia, regional, republic (within RSFSR), kray, oblast, and youth newspapers that took place in Moscow. Among those who spoke before the journalists were Ministers M.N. Poltoranin, N.V. Fedorov, and E.A. Panfilova, and other high-ranking members of the RSFSR Government. Actually, these were not really speeches but rather reflections, together with the journalists, on how to save the mass media and glasnost and protect the interests of the reader.

A meeting with President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin had been awaited with special interest. Boris Nikolayevich did not disappoint the media professionals. Having told them in detail about the latest events in connection with forming the new Commonwealth of Independent States, he then moved to the problems of the mass media. He promised to put on the agenda of the next meeting of the Russian Government to look into the possibility of establishing an acceptable level of prices on paper and tariffs for periodicals distribution, and other economic issues related to the development of glasnost. We are happy to report to TRUD readers that the president also meant such mass circulation publications as our newspaper.

The journalists met with applause B.N. Yeltsin's promise to send the Russian law on the press back for more modifications since, in the opinion of the audience, it requires serious improvements.

(TASS) The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee on the Mass Media, Liaison With Public Organizations and Citizens Mass Movements, and Public Opinion Study today made a decision to ask the president of Russia to include in the draft budget for next year subsidies to cover the unplanned expenses of periodical print media.

Because of increased printing and delivery expenses and the monopolistic arbitrariness in the prices on paper, by most optimistic predictions the money collected for 1992 subscriptions will "last" three to four months. Also, the higher the publication's circulation, the more losses it will incur.

Media Law Accused of 'Stifling' Press Freedom

PM3112153691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Dec 91 p 2

[Viktor Kozhemyako report, plus unattributed report on remarks by Russian Minister of Justice Nikolay Fedorov, under the rubric "The Press Under Pressure": "Law on Stifling?"]

[Text] RIA has disseminated the text of an open letter from the authors of the draft RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Law "On the Mass Media." A disturbing letter! It is indeed a rare document in which the authors of a draft law are forced to state publicly that the law adopted on the basis of the draft they themselves prepared is undemocratic. And this happened largely because of amendments made to the draft when it was adopted at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session's 19 December sitting.

The draft has become law. And the public is seriously concerned: What kind of act of law will henceforth regulate the activity of our press? Will it serve to extend the freedom of the press or, on the contrary, to stifle it? The opinion of many people who have had the opportunity to study the text of the new law is that this is by no means a step forward compared with the Union Law on the Press that has operated hitherto. Indeed, it is a big step back. It represents a real assault on the rights of the press and on the work and opportunities of journalists, which should be widened in a rule-of-law state. The press is coming under heavy pressure from all kinds of restrictions. Alas, such are the bitter fruits of our democracy today...

What is to be done? The authors of the draft law see only one solution: intervention by the Russian president and the deletion of the undemocratic amendments from the law in the course of an additional examination in parliament. Let us hope that B.N. Yeltsin uses his right of veto and justice triumphs after all. [Kozhemyako ends]

The Russian minister of justice has spoken critically of the new Russian law on the mass media. "The documents adopted by parliament," Nikolay Fedorov stated, "are far more conservative than the current normative acts." He also expressed regret that the Russian legislators are delaying the adoption of laws on an amnesty for people convicted of economic crimes.

All-Union Radio, TV To Become New Company

LD3012201391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 29 Dec 91

[Text] The Ostankino company will be financed from the Russian state budget in 1992, but by the end of that year its management should develop a share-issue plan. This was announced by Oleg Dobrodeyev, editor-in-chief of the TV NEWS AGENCY [INFORMATSIONNO-TELEVISIONNOYE AGENTSTVO], and Boris Nepomnyashchiy, the agency's general director, at a news conference held today at the TV center about the reorganization by Russian presidential decree of the All-Union Television and Radio Broadcasting Company into the "Ostankino" All-Russian Television and Radio Broadcasting Company.

It is planned that 51 percent of the shares will be allocated to employees, with open subscription being announced for the remainder. Citizens of the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] countries and others may become shareholders. This means the privatization of what was central television. The TV NEWS AGENCY was singled out at the news conference. From the new year, news bulletins will go out five times every 24 hours, and will be 20 minutes long. They will be received simultaneously throughout CIS territory. On Sundays a review and analysis program called "Itogi" will be broadcast.

Asked how "Ostankino" will get on with Russian Television, which is also financed from the Russian budget, Boris Nepomnyashchiy answered, on a fraternal basis, but as a competitor.

Novgorod Oblast Radio, TV Company Reorganized

LD0201095992 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 2330 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Text] This is Slavich on the air with sound and video.

Those words have been heard for the first time by viewers and radio listeners in Novgorod Oblast. The local television and radio committee has been transformed into the Slaviya state television and radio company. It was founded by the Ministry of Press and Information of the Russian Federation, the oblast soviet of people's deputies and the labor collective of the television and radio committee. The company will carry out its activities following new principles, basing itself only on the interests of the television viewers and radio listeners.

Interrepublic Affairs

Yeltsin, Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan Sign Treaty

LD2912133491 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 29 Dec 91

[By TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow December 29 TASS—A treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance between Russia and Armenia was signed here on Sunday [29 December] by Boris Yeltsin and Levon Ter-Petrosyan.

Answering questions from reporters, the Russian president said that the treaty gives special attention to the observance and guaranties of human rights and liberties and to economic interaction. He said Russia can give economic support to Armenia suffering from a crisis. He also said a number of specific economic agreements will be concluded.

Regarding the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict, Yeltsin said that efforts to settle it failed to achieve real results. Yeltsin said that at a meeting of heads of the eleven states—members of the Commonwealth of Independent States to be held in Minsk on Monday [30 December]—"efforts will be made to advance towards the solution to this problem."

Ter-Petrosyan believes the signing of the treaty "will be a truly historic event." "For the first time in 300 years Russia and Armenia got down to a negotiating table as equal partners," he said. "In addition to strengthening our relations, the treaty can become a stabilising factor in Transcaucasia and in the Middle East," Ter-Petrosyan said.

Yeltsin Comments on Ties

LD2912235891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2200 GMT 29 Dec 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] [Announcer Boris Kostenko] A treaty of friendship, cooperation, and mutual security between Russia and Armenia has been signed in Moscow.

[Correspondent I. Pankov] The signing of the treaty was preceded by talks between Boris Yeltsin and Levon Ter-Petrosyan. The president of Russia commented that Russia had earlier, too, signed bilateral treaties with the repoublics, but within the context of the Union. Now, however, Russia and Armenia are independent states recognized by many countries in the world, and the treaty between them is a treaty between equals.

Boris Yeltsin stressed that Russia is able today to give Armenia economic support, given the crisis situation that has come about there. Regarding the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict, the Russian president acknowledged that the efforts hitherto exerted to resolve it have failed to yield results. He expressed the hope that at tomorrow's meeting in Minsk, the heads of the 11 states will nevertheless manage to move forward a political solution of this issue.

President Levon Ter-Petrosyan of Armenia thinks that in addition to strengthening relations between the two states, the treaty may become a stabilizing factor in the Transcaucasus and in the Near East. [video shows talks between Yeltsin, Ter-Petrosyan, and delegations]

Regional Affairs

Yeltsin Grants Additional Powers to Popov

LD0101180192 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Text] Russian President Boris Yeltsin has signed a decree which gives additional powers to Gavriil Popov, mayor of Moscow. The decree will be published in the next few days, one of the members of the coordinating council of the Democratic Russia Movement told an RIA correspondent. According to him, the decree does not envisage the dissolution of representative power bodies in Moscow.

Moscow Mayor Opposes New City Status Law

92UN0548B Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Dec 91 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Appeal to Muscovites"]

[Text] **Moscow Mayor G. Popov and Vice Mayor Yu. Luzhkov have issued an appeal to Muscovites. In particular, the statement says:**

"Moscow is on the threshold of a hard winter and a most difficult economic and political crisis. The situation that lately has been developing in the city makes is necessary for us to inform you of the consequences that will result from the passing of the draft law "On the Status of the City of Moscow as RSFSR Capital," developed by the deputy faction Smena-Novaya Politika and now under consideration by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. This absolutely unacceptable version of this law vitally important for Muscovites has emerged suddenly, and the Moscow mayoralty has not even been informed of it officially. This draft replaces another one jointly worked out by a Supreme Soviet working group, the Moscow City Council, and the mayor. The document, as adopted in its first reading, does not contain practically anything other than provisions regulating the relations between the Russian authorities and Moscow in the sphere of capital city functions.

Adoption of the law on the status of Moscow in this version will lead to a situation where the popularly elected mayor of Moscow will be reduced to a status of appointed ispolkom [executive committee] chairman, all socioeconomic programs adopted by the mayor and the government of Moscow will be annulled, the irreversibility of the housing privatization will be threatened, and the confrontation between the rayon soviets and the Moscow city council will be resumed.

We consider it absolutely impermissible to adopt a law that will regulate the life of a city of 10 million without reconciling it with the mayoralty, without publishing it in advance, and without a public discussion. The decisive word should belong to the Muscovites.

Moscow Sets Up New Militia; Nikitin Appointed

LD2712195991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1540 GMT 24 Dec 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Belskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 24 Dec (TASS)—The Moscow Government at a sitting today approved the creation of a city public order security service, the local militia. Colonel Leonid Nikitin, a person who went from a rank investigator to become the head of one of the rayon internal affairs departments the capital, was appointed as its head.

Therefore a fundamentally new law-enforcement body is being set up, which will be under the direct jurisdiction of the city administration. According to its organizers, the local militia will replace the existing one in the future.

The new service intends to employ people from Moscow, and will discontinue the recruitment of people from the countryside and from other towns, as was done until recently.

Further on 'Safety' Militia

PM0201103892 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Dec 91 Union Edition p 2

[Andrey Pokrovskiy report from Moscow under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Another Militia in the Capital?"]

[Text] The government of Moscow has adopted a resolution on setting up a public safety militia—a local militia.

Thus in addition to the existing territorial militia with the usual services—precinct inspectors, criminal investigation, patrol units, and so forth—there are to be another 3,000 people, tasked with the duty of patrolling Moscow's most criminal points. It is proposed that patrol and post duty functions will be carried out by militiamen with higher legal education and excellent physical qualities (height over 180 cm). This decision is based on experience in Taganskiy Rayon, where a municipal militia subunit has been in operation for about a year.

Unfortunately, in the course of the discussion of this question a whole series of problems fell down a crack in the debate. For instance: Where do you find people willing to serve in such a unit, when the Moscow militia is currently more than 6,000 men below strength, and the line of staffers waiting for their discharge resembles the waiting line for meat at state prices?.. The system is short of 2,400 lawyers with higher education. And another thing: Is it expedient to create an additional militia with exactly the same functions on the same territory?

'Uncontrolled Prices' Affect Moscow Shoppers

LD0201132992 Moscow TASS in English 1243 GMT 2 Jan 92

[By TASS Correspondent Viktor Petrenko]

[Text] Moscow January 2 (TASS)—Santa Claus was not overly generous in Russia this new year: uncontrolled prices for goods and services made all purses and wallets obsolete overnight. Now you have to take along a bagful of rubles when you go shopping to bring back anything at all, Muscovites say with a sad smile.

One of the last resolutions adopted by the Russian Government before the new year gives enterprises and organisations across the Russian Federation the right to charge prices for their goods and services that reflect the demand-and-supply of the market.

There are exceptions to this rule. Price and rate ceilings will be established for some staples and everyday services. Prices tripled for certain bread and dairy products this morning, sugar prices have gone up 3.5 times, matches four times. Rural inhabitants will pay eight kopecks per one kilowatt of electricity consumed. A city dweller will pay 12 kopecks for the same.

The price of railway tickets has doubled, and air travel will cost thrice as much as yesterday.

Economists expect prices for most goods and services to soar within days or even hours, as the country does not have enough goods to satiate the market and savings banks have hoarded nearly one trillion roubles in individual accounts.

Neither the industry nor agricultural sector are able to satiate the market within months or even years, while foreign aid cannot make up the difference. Production in virtually all sectors of the economy is in a slump. According to the State Committee for Statistics, the output of non-edible goods during the first 11 months of 1991 was three per cent below the level of the same period in 1990. Imports never rose above 35 per cent of the previous year's figures. The food supplies over the same period of time were 15 per cent less and their imports dropped by one-third.

Wide-scale privatisation is now expected to "suck in" extra money and help stabilize the commodity market. Economist Nikolayu Shmelev warns that privatization can be effective only if it runs parallel to price liberalization and compensation for the losses to individuals.

The Russian government intends to deregulate ownership quite soon. On New Year's Eve, guidelines were adopted for the privatisation of state-owned and municipal enterprises. The government resolution provides a clear-cut schedule listing utilities and stages of the sell-off.

It is not yet clear what former Soviet republics will do. Russia has freed prices without coordinating the schedule and mechanism with other republics, resulting in complaints from Ukraine. Ukraine says Russia has failed to provide sufficient amounts of currency to enable it to free prices at the same time. President Leonid Kravchuk said Ukraine would free prices on January 10, but would take dependable measures before that date to safeguard its economy.

St. Petersburg Mayor Requests More Powers

LD2712181591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 26 Dec 91

[Text] According to the ANI Agency, Anatoliy Sobchak, the mayor of St. Petersburg, at the session of the city soviet, requested additional powers in the sphere of determining the estimates of expenditures and revenues for the first quarter of next year. He also asked the deputies to permit him to dispose of funds remaining from the year that is ending. In the course of the debates the majority of the deputies of the city soviet displayed a sharply negative attitude to Sobchak's proposal. A draft, in which the endowment of Sobchak with additional powers is envisaged at best only for January 92, was adopted as the basis for a decision on this matter.

Allegation of Sobchak Bribery Investigated

LD2712170491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 26 Dec 91

[Text] The St. Petersburg procuracy is examining the trustworthiness of a statement by Yuriy Shutov, former aide to the city's mayor, Anatoliy Sobchak. Shutov claims that while holding the post of Lensovet chairman, Sobchak allegedly received a bribe from one of the local businessmen. The INTERFAX agency reported that on the basis of the results of the investigation, the procuracy will either institute criminal proceedings against Sobchak for receiving bribes or against Shutov for slandering a public servant. It is intended to complete the investigation in January.

St. Petersburg Security Chief To Monitor Aid

LD3112232191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1000 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Text] It is reported from St. Petersburg that Sergey Stepashin, chairman of the Federal Security Agency of Petersburg and the oblast, has agreed to take part in monitoring the arrival of food in the city from abroad. This was announced following Stepashin's meeting on 29 December with St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak. At the meeting, the mayor stated that he trusts neither the state trading system, nor the cooperative one. Sobchak considers them to be corrupt and he will rely only upon staff of the Federal Security Agency, the Army, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Security. It has been announced that Russian President Boris Yeltsin has allocated Petersburg an extra 2 million dollars, with which food will be purchased in European countries. The food will be delivered by NATO aircraft and be accompanied to consumers by Soviet Army servicemen. Subordinates of Federal Security Agency Chairman Sergey Stepashin will supervise the delivery of food to specific recipients.

Chechen Republic Adopts Neutrality Declaration

PM2712152691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Dec 91 p 1

[Untitled report from PRAVDA-TASS-INTERFAX column]

[Text] A declaration of neutrality which has the force of law was adopted yesterday by the parliament of the Chechen Republic. The document says, in part: The Chechen Republic will not participate in any military alliance or agreement of an aggressive nature, but it reserves the right to use all internationally recognized means to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Chechen-Ingush Leader on 'Difficult Legacy'

LD2912144591 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 0615 GMT 29 Dec 91

[Interview with Dzhokhar Dudayev, president of the Chechen-Ingush Republic, by reporter Grigoriy Chnykhalov in Dudayev's office in Groznyy; from the "Caucasian Review" program—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Dudayev] Our legacy is a difficult one. It is an extremely difficult legacy. The most repulsive aspect of the whole thing is that those who spent about a century implanting this legacy are now adopting methods which are far from lawful, both parliamentary and diplomatic methods. You must understand that we are very wealthy in terms of material and economic resources. We have so much output and foodstuffs that, even if stocks were not replenished, we could survive for three years without hardship. The old structures which have retained their old positions and do not want to switch voluntarily to democratic and law-based structures and share with their citizens are one issue. Another is the Russian structures supporting them and attempting to use these sections of society here to determine the political and military climate and bring about confrontation. [passage omitted]

The year 1991 has for us been the culmination of 300 years of expectations. But it is not just a matter of expectations; it has been a most bitter struggle. I view it as the result of many centuries—three centuries—of struggle by the Chechen people.

I think 1992 will be much more favorable in meeting our aspirations, and this applies not just to us but also to those around us and to world civilization. Any state system embarking on the road of democracy and international law is a contribution to world civilization. The more states and peoples like this there are, the more peaceful the world will be and the more favorable the conditions for the development of human society on earth, without wars, without terrorism, and without provocations at the state level. There are more methods being found to establish peaceful, law-based, parliamentary, and human contacts and for resolving all problems.

[Chnykhalov] You know that you are in fact overturning the stereotype with which your name has been associated. Some people compare you with and put you in the same rank as leaders like al-Qadhdhafi or Husayn. Are you angered by this, or does it perhaps provide some satisfaction?

[Dudayev] Let me tell you that these comparisons are inappropriate; those who say this do not know the real route taken by either al-Qadhdhafi or Saddam Husayn, let alone the route chosen by the Executive Committee I lead. If they are comparing my route to theirs, they simply do not know. The do not know my route or those of the others. People make certain comparisons. Many come here with one view and leave with quite a different one.

[Chnykhalov] I daresay we are among their number. Thank you for the interview.

Naval Nuclear Waste in Murmansk Reported

LD3112213891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2210 GMT 30 Dec 91

[Video report from Murmansk by correspondent L. Obukhova—from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] [Announcer] Ecological news from Murmansk: unfortunately it is not gladdening news.

[Obukhova] Unfortunately no one in our country bears responsibility for people's health. Within the borders of Murmansk are located the repair bases of the atomic military and icebreaker fleets, and here at the anchorage nuclear fuel waste is stored on the ships Imandra and Lotta. One is alarmed by the fact that so far no independent ecological expert study has been made and the trusting people remain ignorant, including those who are directly on duty there. [Addressing woman in unidentified uniform] Do you not think this is dangerous for people?

[Woman] I don't think so, we have all got used to it.

[G. Matishev, Doctor of Biological Sciences, Director of MMBI (expansion unknown)] People are not worried because they have not experienced for themselves what this means. This is a city of half a million people, and no one knows what may happen. There have already been minor accidents on these ships and in this fleet. The nuclear fleet base should be removed outside the city limits of Murmansk and the Kola Bay.

[Obukhova] Now another nuclear monster has appeared today in the roadsteads of Kola Bay—the aircraft carrier Nikolay Kuznetsov. (Video shows various ships, city and bay]

Murmansk To Withdraw 3 'Atomic Icebreakers'

LD0101184992 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0500 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Text] The Murmansk Sea Shipping Line has decided to withdraw three atomic icebreakers from operation. Yuriy Arkhipov has the details.

[Arkhipov] The financial and economic situation in which the enterprise finds itself as a result of the changes taking place in the former Soviet Union has compelled the Murmansk Sea Shipping Line to withdraw from operation two atomic icebreakers—the Sibir and the Arktika—and the Sevmorput atomic light carrier transport vessel. The first and, perhaps, the main reason is that the flow of cargo transportation has sharply dwindled in the Arctic and vessels have been standing idle. At the same time, the Murmansk Sea Shipping Line does not get anything from the state toward maintaining the atomic fleet.

The second reason for making such a decision is because of the increase in the price of nuclear fuel. Its cost amounts to exactly a half of the cost of an atomic ship, and this adds up to several tens of million rubles. Having calculated their losses, economists have drawn the following conclusion: In order to ensure a smooth operation along the northern sea routes, as few as six units of the icebreaking fleet are enough, while the Sibir, the Arktika, and the Sevmorput should be moored until better times.

True, not simply moored but with some advantage. For this purpose a program for using these vessels has been developed which makes it possible to cut the enterprises in 1992. Talks are now underway with representatives from Nakhodka on using the two atomic icebreakers in that port as electric power plants. If these plans flounder for some reason, the atomic ships will be simply mothballed. In connection with this, a question arises about the radiation situation in Murmansk: Will it deteriorate when three atomic vessels are moored near the town? In a conversation, Nikolay Matyushenko, acting head of the shipping line, said that by that time scientists will have developed new technology for discontinuing the use of atomic vessels, which will guarantee that the radiation threat will not increase in Murmansk. It is more likely, Matyushenko stressed, that the two ships of the atomic fleet, which is unique in the world, will have to become electric power plants for an indefinite period of time.

Tatarstan Groups Protest Joining Commonwealth

LD0201013592 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 2330 GMT 1 Jan 91

[Text] Coordinators of the Soglasiye [Accord] and Narodovlastiye [People's Power] parliamentary groups have made a statement saying that the tackling of the issue of Tatarstan's joining of the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] as one of the founders can only be carried out on the basis of a wide national referendum, which has not yet taken place in the republic.

The declaration of the republic's joining of the CIS, which was adopted at the latest session of Tatarstan's Supreme Soviet, has been deemed juridically void. Deputies also assert that there was no quorum during the voting procedure.

Kamchatka Complains About Lack of Consultation

OW0101152892 Moscow Central Television Second Program and Dubl Networks in Russian 0730 GMT 17 Dec 92

[Video report by unidentified correspondent; from the "Dalniy Vostok" program]

[Text] Now a report from Kamchatka. The citizens of the oblast were alarmed at hearing the announcement that an agreement had been concluded between the Russian Government and a number of companies abroad, in concordance with which foreign fishermen will receive a fishing quota on the Kamchatka and Kuril shelves in exchange for construction of agricultural projects. The Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy City Soviet of Peoples' Deputies resolved to appeal to all soviets in the Far East. [video shows an unidentified correspondent interviewing two men, A.B. Vakarin, chairman of the Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy City Soviet, and M.B. Mashkovtsev, a city soviet deputy]

[Begin recording] [Vakarin] Throughout our history, we inhabitants of the outlying areas of Russia have constantly been presented with a fait accompli—some law, project, or agreement has been adopted and we are simply advised. Presently, as soon as we read in the press—in SOVIETSKAYA ROSSIYA and PRAVDA—about a draft agreement which is being prepared between our Ministry of Agriculture and an American company for the long term rental of our 200 mile zone for extracting 330,000 tonnes of fish, we considered it our duty to raise the issue before the inhabitants of the Far East. Since the basic industry of our national economy is fishing, to deprive our fishermen of the right to fish in our 200 mile zone is a step backwards. That is, we feel we had no right to keep silent if, in some way, the [word indistinct] social security and social guarantees of our fishermen is affected. Once again something is taken from us, and once again nothing is given in return, in the first instance to our fishermen and our population. [video shows correspondent interviewing Mashkovtsev]

[Mashkovtsev] We are not fishermen nor specialists in the fishing industry, and maybe we do not have the means to judge in detail whether this agreement is good or not; but the task of our commission is, first of all, to warn of the possibility of social conflicts, and not to have to douse them later when they develop into difficult-to-stop strikes. Therefore, having learned that such an agreement is being prepared somewhere, and for some reason our oblast authorities are not reacting in any way and not informing anyone, we decided it is our duty to draw the attention of those authorities in the Far East who can get involved and who can bring in qualified experts and specialists to evaluate whether this agreement is good or not in order that a decision can be made which takes our opinion into consideration.

[Vakarin] So everything is considered, and if it is presented convicingly and conclusively, then by all means let them fish as agreed. [end recording]

Far East Official Denies Separation Efforts

OW0101135892 Moscow Central Television Second Program and Dubl Networks in Russian 0730 GMT 17 Dec 91

[Report on interview with N.N. Danilyuk, president of the Far East Association of Soviets, by V. Voropayev; place and date not given; from the "Dalniy Vostok" program—recorded]

[Text] [Danilyuk] I suffer deeply and even sleep poorly when I hear of that more and more independent states are forming. As a matter of fact, we began to literally rip this country, its economic mechanism, from limb to limb while it was still alive.

The Far East Association, created last August, sprang up for objective reasons, insofar as before it existed, we had a centralized government where every territory, kray, and oblast was locked to the center. They were governed, and their production was distributed. The center correspondingly gave these territories capital investment and resulting food and consumer goods. By 1990, this system was destroyed.

Second, in a situation where all economic ties were destroyed, some kind of regulation became necessary, even if it was just for conditions in the Far East economic region.

Third, the problem pursued by the association was the development of unified methods of approach in putting the concerns of Russian economic participation in the development of the Far East before those of the Russian Government.

We have not and do not intend to raise the issue of forming a Far East republic. We fully understand that a state must be a state. Therein lies its power, but, nevertheless, recent experience has shown that the association will have to assume separate functions, including state appointments. It seems that our opinions do not differ from the thoughts of the president of Russia, who, in his decree of two weeks ago, legalized the territory's economic bodies, defined their aims and tasks, and instructed the government to hand over a number of state functions to the Far East Association for management.

Today's Far Easterners, at least their leadership, do not want to raise the issue of separating from Russia. But we do say that if Russia, the Russian Government, does not participate in the economic development of the Far East we will be forced to demand certain defined authority, to include, at the very least, the rights of a union republic.

[Voropayev] Hopefully Far Easterners will be united on this and able to make a choice if the time comes.

[Danilyuk] For our part we are doing everything to avoid this, that is, separation, and hope that these processes survive in the Russian Federation, that is, that there would be no moves for separation.

Balkar Referendum Held on Sovereignty

LD0101184292 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0300 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Excerpts] Tatyana Ulyanova, our Kabarda-Balkaria correspondent, sums up the year's results in her republic.

[Ulyanova] Despite the instability of the political and economic situation, the republic is welcoming the new year, especially children. [passage omitted]

At the referendum of the Balkar people, which has just ended, an opinion was voiced in favor of setting up a sovereign Balkaria, hence of dividing up the republic, something which will make the political situation even more complicated. Fuel shortage has prevented Nalchik residents from fully completing the fall field operations. Therefore, arguments about whether or not the republic needs a president continue to rage. The first round of elections has shown that the answer is not very much. The Balkar people and the majority of the Russian population did not vote, whereas residents of Cossak villages came to the polling stations only to cross out the names of all candidates. So, the second round of elections scheduled for 5 January may not take place, according to specialists' forecasts, especially as Feliks Kharayev, one of the two remaining candidates, has withdrawn his candidacy. [passage omitted]

Dock Workers' Strike Shuts Magadan Port

LD2812025891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1055 GMT 27 Dec 91

[By TASS correspondent Grigoriy Krasnogor]

[Text] Magadan, 27 Dec (TASS)—The maritime trade port ceased work here this morning. The jibs of port cranes have come to a standstill over the holds of ships that have delivered produce for northerners to Nagayevo Bay. The dockers, who have demanded a pay increase of up to 15 rubles per hour, have declared a strike.

International Affairs

Foreign Ministry Outlines Stand on Relations

OW2812184291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1706 GMT 28 Dec 91

[By Mikhail Mayorov and Igor Porshnev from the "Diplomatic Panorama" program; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] **A) Russia Is the Continuer of the USSR**

Russia's leadership proceeds from the assumption that the Russian Federation is the continuer of the USSR as a state. As DP's [Diplomatic Panorama] correspondent learned at its foreign ministry, the 11 independent states that formed the Commonwealth are viewed as successors to the USSR. Russia however, a prominent diplomat explained, "has a unique position and is the continuer of the USSR as a state."

Proceeding from this, the 10 independent states that emerged in the place of the former Soviet republics need to be recognized by the world community. As for the Russian Federation, it needs no international recognition, since this involves a notion that stands to reason. On these grounds the USSR's seat in the UN Security Council is transferred to Russia, and "this is understood by the other Council members," DP was told at Russia's foreign ministry. **B) Agreements With Iraq, North Korea and Cuba Do Not Conform to Russia's "Criteria of Expediency"**

Russia's Foreign Ministry proceeds from the assumption that as the continuer the Russian Federation takes upon itself all international rights and commitments of the former USSR. This involves international agreements and treaties whose number makes up 15 to 16 thousands, a diplomat said.

Some of these agreements do not conform to the "criteria of expediency" Russia is guided by today. By way of concrete example he referred to the agreements with Iraq, North Korea and Cuba signed by the Soviet Union.

Considering that the legacy Russia received is controversial, its foreign ministry began to study and inventory it. If the Bolshevist method of repudiating all that happened in the past is adopted, this would "generate an apalling situation and chaos and undermine trust in Russia," the diplomat said.

Obviously another road will be the most acceptable: Russia takes its legacy as it finds it, but brings the international commitments requiring revision into line with the fundamental principles of its policy. **C) Russia Recognises the Declaration Signed by Japan in 1956**

Russia attaches extremely great importance to its relations with Japan, a prominent Russian diplomat told DP. There is every opportunity for maintaining lasting, neighborly partnership with our Far Eastern neighbor, he said. According to the diplomat, the former USSR leadership only recognized the presence of territorial dispute in its relations with Japan, but actually never began to settle it. Now this dispute will have to be settled by Russia, the Foreign Ministry spokesman pointed out.

According to him, as far as this issue is concerned, one should be guided by "legal imperatives and civilized norms of conduct." Since Russia has inherited all international commitments of the USSR, in its relations with Japan this signifies legal recognition of the declaration signed with Japan in 1956, including the point which mentions the transfer of the islands of Habomai and Shikotan to Japan during the signing of a peace treaty with it.

According to the diplomat, from the legal viewpoint this involves a faultless document ratified by the parliaments of the two countries. "It cannot be cancelled, since this might put an end to diplomatic relations with Japan which developed on its basis", said the Foreign Ministry spokesman. He believes that it's essential to normalize relations with Japan, because "there is no officially fixed border between the two countries." If relations are normalized and the border is fixed, preconditions will emerge for promoting economic cooperation, the diplomat said.

Nevertheless this doesn't mean an automatic or immediate transfer of 2 of the 4 South Kuril islands Japan claims. Talks with Japan on the entire range of issues, including the territorial dispute, will be continued, and "there might be certain distance between the taking of decision and its implementation," the diplomat noted. In any case, a "forcible" solution to the problem is out of the question, he warned.

According to the spokesman, public opinion on this matter will undoubtedly be considered, but it's also necessary to take into account that lately the "Kuril problem" became "a pawn to our political passions", "a much used slogan of orthodox communists." With reference to the stand taken by the Sakhalin governor Valentin Fedorov the diplomat said that this reflects a sort of bankruptcy suffered by himself and by the people he surrounds himself with. **D) Deputy Ministers for External Relations Are Demoted to the Rank of Special Envoys**

The destiny of the deputy ministers for external relations who filled these posts at the time when their ministry was transformed into Russia's Foreign Ministry remains vague. As DP's correspondent learned, so far all of them, including First Deputy Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, have been demoted to the rank of special envoys.

As for the Minister Eduard Shevardnadze who formally has not announced his resignation, according to a prominent Russian diplomat, such an announcement is not required, since his powers were automatically repealed following the decision to dismantle USSR structures.

Kozyrev on Russia's Changed Role in World

PM0201111392 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jan 92 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Russian Federation Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev: "Transformed Russia in a New World"]

[Text] Russia is entering the new year of 1992 transformed. The dark period of our past, of fear and humiliation, is behind us. The Bolshevist experiment, which gave birth to an ugly system for crushing the individual and split mankind for a long time, has ended in total failure. But the outside world now is also not at all what it was in 1917. Around us are not states exhausted by war and bristling against each other. We are surrounded by a civilized international community which has learned to value human interests above all else and which is open to intercourse and cooperation.

Precisely this is why our present transformations are eliciting an amicable response everywhere and are underpinned by broad international support. There has been a wave of recognition of Russia. Our transformed country has not had to wait long years, as the Bolsheviks had to, in order to become a full member of the international community. We are perceived as a democratic, free, and peace-loving state, posing a threat neither to its own citizens nor to other countries.

Not that there is anything automatic in this sincere recognition of Russia. Thus, not all of the state formations which have left the former USSR have yet received the civilized world's "go-ahead." It is an alarming fact that certain leaders, having decided that their election by the whole people grants them an indulgence for a free hand, are trying to create a new machinery of oppression in the place of the dismantled dictatorship and are inventing national variations on the totalitarian ideology.

Not everything is simple in Russia either. It is hard to adapt to the new status and to freedom. The destruction of the old system is accompanied by the crumbling of established economic ties and is giving rise to serious difficulties, which are exacerbated by the overall acute socioeconomic crisis in the country.

The present transformations, for all their revolutionary nature, are still far from being a conspiratorial storming of the Winter Palace accompanied by salvoes from the Aurora and by a bacchanalia of commissars buttoned up in leather. The country took a long, dogged, and at times agonizing time giving birth to democracy.

A gradual awakening from the nightmare began in the mid-eighties. The first shoots of awareness of the absurdity of the Stalinized society began to make headway, and the first signs of active rejection of the totalitarian dictatorship appeared. Perestroyka helped, as it were, to open eyes to the darkest pages of the Bolshevist past. A desire to reject force and the system of coercion and repression came to light.

But, at the same time, the desire of the creators of perestroyka merely to touch up the system's facade, to try to humanize it "in doses," as it were, and to try to attain socialism with a human face through their own "Prague spring" was too obvious. Today, looking back at those years, it is probably possible to say that the chief mistake lay in a failure to understand the totally doomed nature of the Bolshevist system. The rejection of force virtually resulted in the washing away of the regime's supporting structure, and it quickly began to collapse. And renewal itself proceeded inconsistently. Surges ahead alternated with "recoils." Attempts were constantly being made to hold on to a particular slogan. At first they held on for a long time to the socialist camp, then to the socialist choice, and then to the Union. As a result, the ground was all the time slipping away from under their feet, and the objective logic of the development of events was inexorably destroying artificial illusions and preventing them from arriving at a normal human life.

The chief distinguishing feature of the incipient stage in Russia's transformation is that the present processes are not only developing at the rhythm set by the course of history, but are also running ahead of it in some ways. Russia is entering a qualitatively different world. This new world is largely being created under the influence of the Russian revolution. What is taking shape around us is something that could probably be called the "near" abroad. The "former" fraternal republics, which are tired of totalitarian oppression, have chosen, just like Russia, the path of independent development. This is a gratifying process which reassures us and is a guarantee of new friendship.

The chief priority for Russian diplomacy is to shape the Commonwealth of Independent States, which is being formed on the debris of the former Soviet Union. We are not starting with a blank sheet of paper here, for there are already achievements of which we can be proud. Alma-Ata and Minsk and the backbreaking work by the Russian president and the leaders of the other independent states lie behind us. The viability of the emergent Commonwealth can be seen in the fact that natural ties will be far stronger than the shackles of the totalitarian system, which virtually turned us all into prisoners of one huge Gulag.

Voices are sometimes heard saying that the country has fallen apart, that it is not the Soviet Union but the empire of Peter the Great that has broken up, and that Russia has contracted and lost its outlets to warm seas and to Europe. Some even go so far as to maintain that Russia has ended up almost surrounded by enemies. In my view, arguments of this sort largely reflect the inertia of imperial thinking. The country's greatness, particularly on the threshold of the 21st century, is determined not by the scale of its empire but, above all, by the level of its people's well-being. Yes, we occupied one-sixth of the world's land area, and we invariably took pride in this. Yes, we had accumulated vast masses of weapons, brandishing them where necessary and not necessary and threatening to annihilate everyone. We were very proud of this, too. But at the same time we bashfully kept quiet about the fact that the former USSR had almost the highest infant mortality and that people were daily subjected to humiliations, being forced to expend more time and effort on the search for the most meager sustenance even than on the "construction sites of communism." Was this the greatness of the totalitarian empire? After all, let us take a country such as Switzerland and ask this question: Who had more right to be proud of their country—the Swiss or the former "Soviets"? I believe that only people with a very morbid and distorted perception of reality could reckon that "the Soviets have their own pride."

No sober-minded person would agree with the shouts of the newly fledged red-brown fuehrers fanning chauvinist hysteria and promising to shower the empire's "prodigal sons" with radioactive waste. The zigzags of those politicians who attempt once again to impose strong-arm solutions on Russia under cover of calls for order to be instilled, and who push public opinion toward dubious rally politics are frankly irresponsible.

But it would also be wrong to close our eyes to the difficulties that exist. We must understand that at present only a kind of process of adapting to one another is taking place. After long years of oppression many people are still showing a heightened desire for independence and genuine freedom. This is a perfectly normal phenomenon which must not disconcert us. We must simply learn to live as independent states and to look on one another as equal partners.

After all, the former omnipotent center, which imposed its options by hook or by crook just to hold on to its dominant positions, no longer exists. The free states will find a common language and reach agreement on the optimum forms of communal life. The ideas of our peoples' unity have already been found and are being fleshed out. Accord has been reached on unified defense and a unified military-strategic space, and the outlines of socioeconomic cooperation have been mapped out. All this presupposes a further increase in what has been accumulated so that our new formation does not prove still-born.

We treat with understanding our partners' desire to acquire all the necessary appurtenances of independence, to have their own army, to have clearly defined borders, etc. At the same time we must not deny the whole complex package of problems that attend the processes of the gaining of independence by all of us. This is precisely why we need a transitional period which would enable us to avoid a repetition of the hasty Bolshevist solutions and would present opportunities for the totalitarian empire's smooth transition into the Commonwealth of Democratic Independent States.

Equality of rights does not absolve Russia of its special responsibility, entrusted to it by history. This primarily concerns nuclear weapons. The establishment of unified reliable control over nuclear weapons will, I am convinced, ensure lasting security both for Russia itself and for the other states of the Commonwealth. The aim of Russian diplomacy over the next few years will be to achieve radical reductions in nuclear weapons and the curtailment of the arms race and to seek the way to minimal nuclear sufficiency with the prospect of the complete elimination of nuclear arsenals.

We are counting on a dependable partnership with foreign states to resolve our many tasks. I would particularly like to speak about relations with the United States. For too long the situation of confrontation with that country was created artificially. We can see no reasons today that might seriously hinder the setting up of fruitful cooperation between Russia and the United States. We do not share the fears expressed by some people that the United States will now supposedly dictate its will to us, become the sole superpower, and so on. Such a vision would, once again, be a repeat of old stereotypes. We ourselves threaten no one and we proceed from the premise that no developed, democratic, civilian society, in which a reasonable, rational principle holds sway, can threaten us.

In general, in our relations with the West we will have to take to their logical conclusion the not always consistent steps toward rapprochement started with perestroyka. The developed countries of the West are Russia's natural allies. It is time finally to say firmly that we are not adversaries, nor in any way poor kid brothers obediently following the orders of a rich and malevolent West bent on buying up Russia.

We have stated our commitment to democracy, the paramountcy of the individual, human rights, and the free market. We have done this not in order to gratify the West, but primarily for ourselves, since it is we Russians who are interested in the triumph of democracy and the observance of human rights here and the final elimination of the debilitating shortage of goods.

Some people might retort that the USSR has had no lack of creditors and that particularly in recent years all the channels of humanitarian aid have virtually been opened. But let us ask the honest question: Have we felt real results from the aid? Huge loans have been wasted. Resources which could have helped at least in some way to improve the population's standard of living have been squandered. The explanation here is simple. Despite all the assurances and slogans proclaimed, no real economic reform has been carried out. All perestroyka's plans for economic transformation have resulted merely in cosmetic and haphazard repair of the administrative edict economy.

To make the aid granted us effective today and break out of the chaotic spiral of credits it is essential to radicalize the economic reforms and channel the credits received to strengthening them. We must seek to become part of the world economy and absolutely comply with the clear rules of modern financial and economic conduct. We regard IMF membership as one of our priorities, having assumed commitments to carry out macroeconomic reforms. Credits will then yield tangible fruit. Our active foreign policy and our diplomacy are essential to ensure our economic entry into the world community through international recognition and thereby help satisfy Russia's domestic needs, too.

Russia does not intend to turn its back on the developing countries. We are in no way abandoning our participation in efforts to overcome the acute problems experienced by this extensive group of states. Today this involves carrying through the timid attempts of the recent past to stop looking at the Third World in terms of ideological struggle. A policy of channeling flows of so-called aid to various kinds of dictators while our own population is experiencing a lack of the most basic necessities can only be described as immoral. We will share with and help those who are in real need and use the resources obtained not for building up their military and police forces, but for the socioeconomic development of the countries.

On the whole, as it discovers the world, Russia seems to be recovering its common sense. Its diplomacy is oriented toward the interests of real people, its citizens. Today at Smolensk Square [location of Foreign Ministry] I will be leading not a detachment of revolutionary sword bearers, but a collective of democratically minded people with a good knowledge and understanding of their people's interests and anxieties.

In general, the appearance of Russian diplomacy is considerably different from the scarcely attractive image of Soviet diplomacy which has been quietly laid to rest. Many people will remember the diplomat of the former USSR as a morose and impenetrable bureaucrat, blinkered by rigid ideological guidelines and ready to serve the nomenklatura elite. The closed nature of the totalitarian society and its panic-stricken fear of foreigners had the result that contact with the outside world was permitted only to a very narrow group of people who had gone through the regime's multi-tier system of filters and had proven their loyalty to it. The vast bulk of people inhabiting this gigantic country were essentially cut off from real contact with foreigners. Within society fear, suspicion, and mistrust were constantly fueled. Every foreign visitor was virtually regarded as a potential agent, many checks were carried out, and endless forms were filled in. The diplomacy of such a society could not fail to assume hideous forms and could not fail to be transformed into a sort of diplomatic detachment of the CPSU.

The end of the totalitarian USSR and the entry into the arena of the democratic forces in Russia destroyed this cast-iron structure. Present-day Russian diplomacy sees its main aim as helping the Russian people gain a life worthy of the individual, restoring the pride of Russians in their own country and restoring to them the opportunity to make full use of the vast potential of the Russian land's riches. We want the word "Russian" to have a proud ring so that our fellow countrymen abroad are not the object of suspicion and are not regarded as part of a system which contains a threat to the civilized world. Russian diplomacy must be oriented as much as possible toward the interests of people and must work to ensure that foreign policy increases the assets of Russians and does not reduce them.

But as for our "supertask," one cannot help recalling the words of Charles de Gaulle, who said that he would be happy when every French woman came home from the market contented and smiling. The Russian Foreign Ministry will feel that it has been useful when Russian women no longer wait in line for hours thinking of how to feed their families, but are able to spend more time thinking of how to use their charms to please their replete Russian men. But as for schemes and concepts, we will develop our foreign policy guidelines through democratic institutions, which are designed to convey the will of the people to the executive. I want to assure Russians that our diplomacy will be open and that we will consult with them in the most important areas of the country's foreign policy course.

I wish Russians a Happy New Year: May it be a year of hopes and wishes fulfilled for them.

[Footnote] Andrey Vladimirovich Kozyrev, aged 41, was born in Brussels, Belgium. In 1974 he graduated from the Moscow Institute of International Relations. In the USSR Foreign Ministry he progressed from consultant to administration chief.

In October 1990 he was appointed Russian foreign minister. He is a candidate of historical sciences and author of books on disarmament problems. He speaks English, French, and Portuguese. He is married and has a daughter.

Outlines Policy Direction

LD2812230291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2040 GMT 28 Dec 91

[Unscheduled interview with Andrey Vladimirovich Kozyrev, Russian Federation foreign minister, by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Andrey Vladimirovich, Russian foreign policy and Soviet foreign policy—what difference will there be, and what will be the continuity?

[Kozyrev] Well, I believe that it will be both. First of all, Soviet foreign policy can be divided clearly into two stages: the first stage is that of aggression, and mind you, not so much aggression abroad, but internal aggression. We found ourselves in the grip of this regime, in the grip of the ideology of a besieged fortress. Having won, say, World War II, and having made a great contribution in the crushing of fascism, we, to put it in an imaginative way, lost in time of peace, and, mind you, we lost this peace for ourselves. When even our former....[pauses] the powers that we defeated promptly set down to rebuild their economies, we continued to build up our military muscle, we continued to, so to speak, besiege ourselves, and overlooked the changes in the surrounding world.

The second stage—and I am now talking in terms of long periods—began with 1985, and I believe that President Gorbachev, who has now resigned, and Shevardnadze, whom I actually replaced in this post, can be mentioned here in a positive, good sense, for starting to get free from the load, the oppressive plague that had struck us. However, it must be said that those were, indeed, the years of liberation. Now we already must begin to identify ourselves not as the remains of the old totalitarian colossus, but as new states which formed themselves from its ruins. They must now identify their normal state and national interests, which would consist, partly, of the heritage of what was good in the past, and, mind you, the heritage not only of the Soviet, but also the Russian period.

Here I would like to bring up the figure of Peter the Great, who is very dear to me. You know, this is a type of carpenter's diplomacy, a builder's diplomacy. [reference to the time Peter the Great spent abroad training as a carpenter and builder] I would like to use this opportunity to say that the Russians currently have all the reason to, well, be proud of themselves. I realize that it is difficult to be proud while standing in line. But, look, what a response from the outside world. Without any transition, without any difficulties, without any conditions, we immediately joined the civilized international community. I do not know whether you have noticed it or not, but we have been recognized literally within the last few days; everybody has recognized us. And, actually, this is happening is such a way that we do not need to establish new diplomatic relations and receive new ambassadors, but the ambassadors who were in Moscow, are, actually, staying and becoming the ambassadors in Russia, and the diplomatic relations—the way they were in the Soviet Union—have now become diplomatic relations with Russia, and so on.

This is why, probably, it is not so traumatic for us. But, in reality, this process when a new state is conquering its place can be very hard sometimes. Our place already is prepared for us. In this sense we do not start from scratch. The August events, when we defended the White House and when we, as it were, fought for this democracy, have given us democratic credentials, as it were, in the world.

[Correspondent] Characteristic features of the old Foreign Affairs Ministry, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, were stagnation to a large extent and nepotism to a large extent. The very system of this Foreign Affairs Ministry changed human beings into drab executives, drab diplomats. On the other hand, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs accumulated a vast intellectual potential and some traditions. As a minister, which of the traditions of the old Foreign Ministry will you include in your arsenal, and which will you cast aside?

[Kozyrev] I believe that the answer lies in your question. And I believe that indeed we have to treat this apparatus very carefully. And time will reveal the need for some sort of cooperation and coordination. Not necessarily in Moscow, maybe in Minsk, and we support the idea of it being in Minsk. And here, I repeat this thought, these 200 or 300 people will become useful. Incidentally, we will be ready later to give jobs, as it were, to these 200 or 300 people, the best people by the way. The Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, if one were to apply an average European scale, then the French, German, or British Foreign Ministries consist of 3,000 or 4,000 or sometimes 5,000 employees. We have now set a task for ourselves of cutting back the merged Russian and Union Foreign Ministries to approximately 2,700. I believe that this size will be quite moderate by European standards, but this is a minimum size because, in reality, we are a great power.

Russia is a permanent member of the Security Council. Russia is a nuclear power. It has great European culture, so to speak. So, although, naturally, we need some cutbacks and economy, and first and foremost the cutting back of those people you were talking about—the so-called telephone recruitments, that is what we used to call them before, who were recruited on the instructions of Politburo members and party nomenklatura by the phone—so we have to purge them a little bit. But as for cadres and professionals, you were very correct in saying that the backbone of that department should be preserved. Russia has taken charge of the embassies of the former Union. This is a special feature of our diplomatic recognition. We are recognized as successors, Russia is a state succeeding the Soviet Union. That is why we are not changing our ambassadors.

This will be done at the technical level, as it were. That is, where there used to be an embassy of the Soviet Union, it will become Russian. There are, it is true, two factors that I would like everyone to understand. The point is not that we are usurping these embassies. The point is that each state grants others territory on their territory, grants buildings, on a reciprocal basis. So, all embassy buildings are located on Russian territory in Moscow, located in residences on Russian territory. We will be changing our ambassadors, that is for certain. You know, there are ambassadors who have been sitting in their jobs for too long, who are out of touch, and we saw this during the putsch. There is a small category of ambassadors who were appointed from the former CPSU Central Committee, especially when they felt that the party was losing its grip; they started appointing these party functionaries, as you will recall, in the novel *New Appointments*, approximately like that...

[Correspondent, interrupting] They were called tanks in the Foreign Ministry language.

[Kozyrev] Yes, tanks. And I believe that we will have to get rid of them gradually and bring fresh blood into all of this. Again, however, we will act quite carefully, because diplomacy does not tolerate any fuss, it does not tolerate, as they say, sharp movements. That does not mean that it has to be stagnant, but that everything has to be done very professionally, in a tidy manner, respecting our foreign partners, too.

[Correspondent] Now, perhaps, I would even say, an undiplomatic question. Will the practice be continued of using embassies as covers for the special services?

[Kozyrev] I will reply "yes" to this question, too. You know, these are, of course, somewhat populist propositions we have heard here, that no, no special services, and so on. It is another matter what these special services are engaged in, what job they do. They should not keep tabs on their own people, that is certain, or bear any element of ideological influence on their own people or ideological sabotage against other states, or say, the transfer of party funds and so on. These functions are inadmissible. But, certain functions—say, simply protecting the security of actual embassy personnel—is a professional job.

External intelligence functions, civilized intelligence, is also, in general terms, a necessary job, and all states do it, including using diplomatic cover, as you put it. I would be in favor of parliament—and we will reach this point—adopting a law on external activity, on external service, meaning diplomats, determining their place precisely, and that of other interested departments.

All of Russia's diplomatic levels have now been brought into play; we have not started from scratch. We are not now in the middle of nowhere, we already are known, we already are being accepted, we have established links, and I would repeat that we have every reason not to panic, but to get down to the job and get moving.

[Correspondent] Thank you, we wish you success.

[Kozyrev] Thank you, very much.

On Competition of Ideas

PM3112102991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Dec 91 First Edition p 5

[Article by Andrey Kozyrev, Russian Federation foreign minister: "Throwing Open Door to Outside World"]

[Text] Russians' participation in the formation of Russia's foreign policy course, a knowledge of the interests of the various social groups of Russian society, their amalgamation and generation as Russia's national interests and their embodiment in foreign policy—those are the main aims of the competition of foreign policy ideas named for Ilya Krichevskiy announced by the Russian Foreign Ministry in late August 1991. Letters have been sent by scientific workers and engineers, students, teachers, and pensioners. The geographical location of the competitors is also representative—Moscow and

Moscow Oblast, St. Petersburg, Vladivostok, Samara, Kirov, Omsk, Novocherkassk, Magadan and Orenburg oblasts, and other regions of Russia.

A large number of proposals are connected with disarmament problems. The letters' authors write of the need to reduce nuclear and chemical weapons. There are also numerous proposals for the reduction of the armies of the large military powers. Our correspondents are also perturbed by the problems of arms export and the possibility of the production of biological weapons.

It is essential to note that the disarmament problem or, more broadly, the problem of regulating armed forces and armaments, as it used to be formulated, had become the focus of attention of Russian foreign policy back at the end of the last century. One may recall The Hague international peace conference convened at Russia's initiative in 1899 in which 27 states including Britain, Germany, Italy, the United States, and France took part. This conference adopted three declarations concerning the limitation of means of warfare. Today too the problem of regulating armed forces and arms, which includes questions of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and the destruction of chemical weapons and nonproduction of biological weapons, the restriction of the export of conventional arms, the implementation of international control, and other questions, is a priority for Russia. Russia links the solution of this problem with the creation of the necessary conditions for a stable and secure peace.

Proposals for the consolidation and development of the United Nations and for the role which Russia is designed to play in it as a permanent member of the Security Council also make up a substantial group of ideas. They are written about by M. Zakharova from St. Petersburg, S. Levin from Moscow, A. Stepanenko from Dombarovskiy settlement, Orenburg Oblast, S. Safronov from Balashikha, and many others.

There is no doubt that Russia's active participation in the United Nations and in other international organizations, about which our correspondents write, is one of the main avenues of Russia's foreign policy. Within the framework of the Foreign Ministry an administration is being created which will study the entire package of questions connected with Russia's participation in the work of various international organizations. Previously there was no such administration within the Russian Foreign Ministry structures.

Nor can one fail to agree with the idea voiced in a whole series of letters to the effect that Russia must be opened more widely to the outside world in order definitively to overcome the negative ideas about our people which have formed in many countries. V. Kulikov from Kirov, for instance, suggests beginning a "Russian center" action: instituting Russian multifunctional public missions abroad which would promote and develop cultural and economic relations and help to distribute truthful information about us.

It is characteristic that the Russians want to eliminate as soon as possible the consequences of Russia's artificial separation from communication with states which the former regime had put on the "banned" list. Thus, many people write to us about the importance of developing varied contacts with Israel, where many people of Russian origin are living. And a long and detailed letter by Muscovite G. Muchnik devoted to Russia's relations with Israel and containing many specific proposals has been passed on by us to ambassador A. Bovin to study the possibility of their implementation.

The letters' authors also voice many proposals with regard to Russia's relations with individual countries: China, Taiwan, the countries of the Near and Middle East, Latin America, Africa, and virtually all regions of the world. Unfortunately, the framework of a newspaper article does not provide an opportunity to dwell in more detail on all the proposals—there are over 100 of them. The winners of our competition are L. Yelizarova from Moscow Oblast, Yu. Bayev from Palatka settlement, Magadan Oblast, Muscovite A. Bogaturov, Yu. Vatokhin from Samara, V. Karpov from Voronezh, V. Kulikov from Kirov, M. Litvin-Sedoy and K. Pleshakov from Moscow, N. Ryabchenko from Vladivostok, A. Stepanenko from Orenburg Oblast, and Muscovite V. Trofimov.

In the New Year the Russian Foreign Ministry plans to organize a conference on the subject of "Russia's foreign policy" and to invite to it the participants in the competition and also Russian public and political figures. We think that there will be a broad and interesting talk on the foreign policy paths of the renewed Russia. I think that at this conference we shall recall the best traditions of Russian diplomacy and the activity of outstanding Russian politicians and diplomats like Afanasiy Ordin-Nashchokin, Artamon Matveyev, Vasiliy Golitsyn, Aleksandr Griboyedov, and many others. We also plan to create in the Foreign Ministry a council for Russia's foreign policy and for diplomacy, which would include politicians, parliamentarians, scientists, journalists, and simply our own citizens with a lively interest in international life, so that we can constantly take the pulse of public thought and find correct political guidelines.

In conclusion I want to thank all participants in the competition for taking part in it, to congratulate our winners, and to wish everyone good health and prosperity.

Assesses 'Positive Results' of 1991

LD3112223191 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2100 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Interview with Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Vladimirovich Kozyrev, by commentator S. Vozianov, in the "Vesti" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Vozianov] Andrey Vladimirovich, the meeting of the heads of state of the Commonwealth ended on the eve of the New Year. What are the results we are taking with us into the New Year ?

[Kozyrev] I believe it is positive results that we are taking with us into the New Year. The first is the fact that the Commonwealth has not only taken shape, but has already got down to work. That means that 1992 will not be the year when the Commonwealth's work begins, but the year when it will be working in full measure, as we say. This is borne out by the documents which were achieved in Minsk. These are on the mechanisms of the Commonwealth; second, on military questions; and the same on economic questions. Finally, we created a favorable external environment—this is now an external environment, in our country—for our economic reforms. Finally, the third thing—this external environment, much depends on it in the wider context, so that the international community is also well-disposed toward us and to what is happening in our country, and is ready, from the first days of the New Year—for us, the most difficult ones—to join in in support of the reforms. I think that we must convey all these three obligations—a working Commonwealth, a well-disposed Commonwealth, and a Commonwealth which is well received in the outside world—into the New Year as a Christmas present to the Russian people.

Foreign Ministry Notes USSR as 'Successor'

OW2812162591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1506 GMT 28 Dec 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In the view of the Russian leadership, the Russian Federation is the state-successor of the former Soviet Union. As IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent was told at the Russian Foreign Ministry, all 11 independent states, currently members of the Commonwealth, are considered successors of the former Union. However, Russia, as one high-ranking diplomat specified, "occupies a particular position being the state-successor of the USSR."

All 10 independent states which emerged out of the former Union republics need international recognition. As for the Russian Federation, it does not seek international recognition since "it goes without saying." Consequently, Russia automatically receives a place in the UN Security Council and "its other members understand that."

China Recognizes Russia's Right to UN Seat

LD2712154991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1437 GMT 27 Dec 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Dec (TASS)—"China officially declares that it recognizes the right of Russia to occupy the place of a permanent member of the UN Security Council." This was stated today by Li Lanqing, PRC minister of foreign economic relations and trade, in an interview with a TASS correspondent before the start of Russian- Chinese talks in Moscow.

He said that on the basis of the good relations that exist with Russia, China will be able to continue and develop ties in politics, the economy, and in other spheres. On the subject of trade and economic cooperation between the two states, Li Lanqing stated that here "there are good prospects and the Chinese side is convinced that they will develop successfully."

Talking about prospects for the development of Russian-Chinese relations, Andrey Kozyrev, foreign minister of the Russian Federation, said that from past history "we are taking with us everything that brought us close together, while we leave behind to the former union all disagreements and conflicts." He noted that the talks that are beginning will concern all-round development of bilateral economic relations.

It is planned that the Russian-Chinese talks will take place in two working groups—one on trade and economic ties, and the second on political questions.

Cambodia Recognizes Russia's Independence

LD0201072692 Moscow TASS in English 0716 GMT 2 Jan 92

[By TASS correspondent Igor Shubin]

[Text] Hanoi January 2 TASS—The independent and united Cambodia recognizes the Russian Federation as a sovereign, independent and territorially integral state, Prince Norodom Sihanouk said in an official message addressed to the Russian president, Boris Yeltsin.

According to the news agency SPK, Cambodia also recognized Russia as the legal successor to the former Soviet Union as one of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council.

The head of the new Cambodian state warmly congratulated the president of Russia on the historic declaration of the Commonwealth of Independent States. He expressed confidence that traditional relations of friendship and comprehensive cooperation, which have brought together the two countries for a long time, will continue to develop.

'Good Prospects' Seen for South Korean Ties

LD2712202691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0825 GMT 26 Dec 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Zakharchenko]

[Text] Seoul, 26 Dec (TASS)—Relations between the former Soviet Union and the Republic of Korea will be strengthened, having been transformed into Russian-Korean relations. Oleg Sokolov, ambassador of the former Soviet Union and now Russian ambassador to the Republic of Korea, spoke about this today at a news conference in Seoul. He said that ties between Russia and the Republic of Korea "have good prospects, considering the objective interest of the two countries in strengthening peace, security and cooperation between them and in the whole world."

Replying to journalists' questions, Sokolov said that Russia, as legal successor to the international obligations of the former Union, is naturally keeping in force the 1961 treaty on friendship, cooperation and mutual aid with the DPRK. However, considering the global changes which have taken place, the question of what forms continuing cooperation will take will be the subject of a separate debate in Russia. Concerning problems of nuclear security on the Korean peninsula, the Russian state advocates that everyone, without exception, should fulfil the obligations under the nuclear weapons nonproliferation treaty, including the signing of the relevant agreement with the IAEA, something that applies to North Korea.

An official visit by Russian President Boris Yeltsin to Seoul is still on the agenda, the ambassador said, but on a practical level, it is probably likely in the middle of 1992. Touching on the future of South Korean credits, Sokolov noted that the Russian Federation would take on all financial-economic obligations of the former Union. Though technical questions exist concerning in what form credit relations between the two countries will be implemented, Russia does need credits from South Korea. In the opinion of the ambassador, the Republic of Korea's experience of economic development is of great interest to Russia, especially in the sphere of organization of industry and development of agriculture.

Yeltsin Letter Given to South Korean Pastor

LD3112225191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1316 GMT 31 Dec 91

[by TASS correspondent Ivan Zakharchenko]

[Text] Seoul, 31 December (TASS)—A letter of gratitude from Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin was delivered today by the Russian Embassy in South Korea to a South Korean priest who made donations last autumn to families of the August putsch victims. He is Kim Sang-bok, a senior minister of the Christian Church of Hallelujah. He sent $5,000 to Moscow. The Russian president thanked the minister and his church for "showing solidarity with the peoples of Russia during the putsch, as well as for expressing sympathy for and supporting the families of those who died defending freedom and democracy in our country."

"The three tragic August days yet again demonstrated the common striving of the peoples of Russia for a free and open society. It is extremely difficult for us to feel the loss of young lives, full of strength and energy, which were sacrificed for the triumph of democracy. The Russian leadership will spare no effort to insure that every person living in our country is guaranteed all rights and freedoms of a democratic law-governed society," Boris Yeltsin stressed in his letter. The donations, he noted, are to be handed over to the families of the victims.

Pacific Countries Ship Food to Far East Ports

LD3112220891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0320 GMT 29 Dec 91

[by TASS correspondent Leonid Vinogradov]

[Text] Nakhodka, 29 December (TASS)—Socialist Vietnam, which the former Soviet Union helped to build for many years, does not want to be an ungrateful debtor. The Vietnamese dry cargo ship "Dong Da", which delivered 2,000 tonnes of rice, moored at Nakhodka port today. From Nakhodka the grain will be sent to Kemerovo oblast.

Last year Vietnamese ships were frequent callers at Russian ports in the Far East. They delivered meat for Central Asian republics and rice for the inhabitants of Siberia.

On the whole, countries of the Asia-Pacific Region can become the main source of aid to our country. According to controllers' services at Nakhodka ports, a large quantity of foodstuffs from these countries is planned to arrive at the beginning of January. Several ocean transport ships with wheat are on the way to Nakhodka now; the first of them, "Konstantin Petrovskiy", will deliver 13,000 tonnes of bread grain from Canada on 5 January.

Aid to Kabul Halted; No Release of POW's

OW0201122692 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 2 Jan 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A high-ranking diplomat on the staff of the Russian Federation's Foreign Ministry has told a reporter for Interfax, Russia and the other newly independent republics on formerly Soviet territory, in compliance with their previous commitment, halted military deliveries to Kabul late last month. The Russian Federation and the other formerly Soviet republics that used to let shipments of military hardware to the Najibullah administration across their territory, have, by doing so, complied with a provision of the September treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States under which military aid to any warring faction in Afghanistan was to be discontinued by the end of last year.

The Russian Federation's Foreign Ministry says, however, the Mojaheds have cheated on their pledge to release a group of Soviet POW's by Jan 1, 1992. Mojahed field commanders and the leader of most irreconcilable grouping Hikmatyar still hold the Soviets. They are at odds with the leader of Afghanistan's Islamic Society Rabbani, who promised the POW's would be set free by the end of last year.

Military Advisers 'Expected' To Leave Syria

TA3112182991 Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Arabic 1730 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Text] Our correspondent Dani Levi has learned that the Russian authorities are expected shortly to begin evacuating their advisers, estimated to be in the thousands, from Syria due to the economic difficulties afflicting Russia. It is worth noting that Russian advisers and Army officers are deployed in all branches of the Syrian Armed Forces, including the Navy, and that Soviet naval units still use the Syrian naval base at Tartus.

Romania Agrees to Long-Term Trade

LD3112044491 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 30 Dec 91

[Text] Russia and Romania have signed a long-term trade agreement in Moscow. The Romanian trade minister, Constantin Fota, said the two sides will offer each other a most-favored-trading status. He said the agreements laid down the basis of trade with Russia, which accounts for almost 80 percent of Romania's trade with the former Soviet Union. The Romanian economy is heavily dependent on imports of Soviet fossil fuel and electricity.

UK's Major on Russian EC, IMF Membership

LD0201092392 Moscow TASS in English 0638 GMT 2 Jan 92

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Voytishkin]

[Text] London January 2 TASS—British Prime Minister John Major on Wednesday, January 1, said Russia could become a member of the European Community some time in the future.

Major was speaking over the British Radio about the main directions for the British foreign policy in the second half of 1992, when it would chair the European Community.

The British prime minister stressed that the Community should be open to all independent East European states and the former Soviet Union.

The Community should take a broader look at things, he said. Major said he would like to see the European Community open its doors to the European Free Trade Association member-countries—Sweden, Norway, Finland and Austria—and then to Eastern countries, new democracies, including Russia.

He said Russia's membership in the European Community would fully rule out the nuclear war threat.

Major said he had called on the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to admit Russia as a full-fledged member of these international organisations. Russia must have access to the financial experience amassed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and cheaper loans, he said.

Under Boris Yeltsin, this country is making the first painful but necessary steps towards a market economy, the British prime minister said.

Moscow, St. Petersburg To Receive EC Aid

OW3112182291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1545 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] EC's food aid worth 200 mn ECU [European Currency Unit] will come to Moscow and St. Petersburg in January and March 1992, says a memorandum signed Tuesday [31 December] in Moscow by Ambassador of the Commission of European Communities Michael Emerson, Moscow government minister Vladimir Karnaukhov and deputy chairman of the International Humanitarian and Technical Commission of the Russian government Aleksandr Zhitnikov.

Karnaukhov said to IF [INTERFAX] that the memorandum distributes the aid that is already arriving in accordance with the Russian-EC agreement signed in Brussels on December 20. Russia's two biggest cities will receive 150,000 tons of meat, baby food, butter and medicine. They will be sold via the state distribution network and at two or three auctions. All funds from the sales will be used to implement social programs.

Emerson expressed the opinion that the meat supplies (6000 metric tons daily) will help ease the food crisis and prevent a spurt of prices. According to him, EC will also help the 11 ex-Soviet republics (250 mn ECU). In addition, talks are on to give food credits to all sovereign states for the same amount.

Vatican Recognizes Russian Federation

LD0101190592 Moscow TASS in English 1427 GMT 1 Jan 92

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Golovanov]

[Text] Vatican City January 1 TASS—Vatican recognised the Russian Federation and established "official relations" with it, head of the Vatican's press service Navarro Joaquin told journalists on Wednesday [1 January]. Vatican extended to Russia the official relations it previously had with the USSR. It also informed the Moscow government that Francesco Colasuonno, the Vatican representative in the former USSR, will continue his mission in the Russian Federation.

"As far as other sovereign and independent states are concerned, which appeared as a result of the USSR disintegration, Vatican retains the right to consider their applications for recognition as soon as they come", Joaquin said.

Interstate relations between Vatican and the Soviet Union were established in 1989 after the first visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to Italy and Vatican. The question of establishing diplomatic relations with Russia was discussed by Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev and Vatican's Secretary of State Angelo Sodano during Boris Yeltsin's visit to Vatican on December 20, 1991.

Russia To Exchange Oil for Cuban Sugar

PY2712175891 Moscow Radio Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 0000 GMT 26 Dec 91

[From newscast]

[Text] The Russian news agency [not further identified] today reported that Russia will supply Cuba with oil in exchange for sugar, at world market prices.

Under an agreement which, according to the agency is ready to be signed, Russia will supply Cuba with 4.5 million tons of oil in 1992 in exchange for 2.5 million tons of Cuban sugar.

Foreign Ministry Lauds OAS Efforts in Haiti

LD2912144491 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT 29 Dec 91

[Text] Moscow December 29 TASS—A Russian Foreign Ministry representative issued the following statement on Sunday [29 December]: "Inspiring perspectives have appeared of late in the process of settling the crisis in Haiti. The formula of the political settlement proposed by Augusto Ramirez Ocampo, a special representative of the Organisation of American States (OAS), which calls for well-known politicican Rene Theodore to be prime minister, seems to be very promising. If the Haitian National Assembly finally appoints Theodore as prime minister, part of his mandate will be to create conditions for the lawfully elected president, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, to return home. This might open real possibilities for moving ahead the negotiations on Haitian settlement.

We hope for an adequate reaction from Haiti to the OAS efforts to help solve the crisis, which will promote the restoration of constitutional order, civil peace and quietness in the country".

Belarus

Trade, Economic Agreement Signed With Armenia

LD3112173791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1505 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Text] Minsk, 31 Dec (TASS)—On New Year's eve the governments of Belarus and Armenia signed here an agreement on the principles of trade and economic cooperation. The document notes that guided by the principles of international law and taking into account the friendly relations that have been formed, the parties to the agreement will maintain bilateral links within the framework of a single economic space and will refrain from actions which might cause damage to each other. Settlements and payments with regard to the entire complex of exchanges will be conducted at prices guaranteeing mutual interests. The agreement stipulates measures ensuring the fulfillment of reciprocal deliveries of products, quarterly accounting, and exchange of information at government level, and the use of economic incentives and sanctions to increase the responsibility of suppliers. Belarus and Armenia have also agreed to maintain and develop the transport links which have already been formed.

Moldova

Snegur Voices 'Confidence' in New Year Address

LD0101185892 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1330 GMT 1 Jan 92

[By MOLDOVA-PRESS correspondent]

[Text] Kishinev, 1 Jan (TASS)—Mircea Snegur, president of Moldova, expressed confidence in his New Year address to the republican population that Ukrainians, Russians, the Gagauz population, Bulgarians, Jews, and other peoples living together with the Moldovan population will be able to hold out their hands toward each other for the sake of Moldova's well-being. He stressed that the observance of human rights in general and the rights of ethnic minorities is an absolute guarantee of the democratization of the state.

Speaking about the role of the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS], the president noted that the signing of the documents in Alma-Ata did not mean that Moldova will by all means take part in all CIS structures and programs. "We will cooperate in the spheres which are beneficial for the republic, and we will join the structures which do not encroach upon the sovereignty of Moldova," Mircea Snegur said. The president did not rule out the possibility of the republic also joining other commonwealths of states if Moldova is interested in mutually beneficial cooperation with it.

The Moldovan president expressed the wish that efforts are aimed in the new year at constructive approaches and not at settling various conflicts emerging through the fault of irresponsible politicians.

President Signs Decree Raising Minimum Wage

LD3112051891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1600 GMT 30 Dec 91

[Text] President Snegur of Moldova and President Nabiyev of Tajikistan have signed decrees raising the minimum wage, pension, and student grant. I reported on the Tajik president's decree one hour ago, so now the details of the Moldovan leader's decision:

As of 1 January the minimum wage at enterprises, establishments, and organization will amount to 400 rubles a month, including compensatory payments. And it will be index-linked to price and tariff increases for consumer goods and services.

Resolution Passed on Non-Cash Payments

OW3112010191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2047 GMT 30 Dec 92

[Transmitted by KYODO]

[Text] The government of Moldova has passed a resolution on the promotion of non-cash payments as a means of protecting the internal market and reducing the volume of cash circulating in the republic.

As of January 1, the sale of consumer goods to individual buyers and payments for communal and catering services worth over 2,000 rubles will be made on a non-cash basis.

In the future, an automated network involving magnetic credit cards will be introduced.

Ukraine

Republic Frees Prices, Tariffs 2 Jan

LD3112155791 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 1500 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Text] The Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers has adopted a resolution on the system of prices in the national economy and in the Ukrainian consumer market. It reads:

"In connection with the extremely difficult economic situation and the implementation in the Russian Federation—beginning 2 January 1992—of measures on the liberalization of prices, with the object of protecting the Ukraine market and in accordance with the Ukraine Supreme Soviet Presidium resolution dated 27 December 1991 on social protection of the population and the internal market of the Ukraine, the Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers resolves:

1. To introduce on 2 January 1992 free prices and tariffs on all produce, goods, and services that will be fixed by enterprises and organizations in accordance with supply and demand, with the exception of produce, goods, and services on which this resolution envisages state price and tariff regulation. To establish, starting 2 January

1992, limits for raising state prices and tariffs on certain types of produce, goods, and services of important economic and social significance in accordance with the appendix.

2. The Ukraine Ministry of Finance, with the agreement of the interested ministries and departments of the Ukraine, is to envisage when necessary the allocation of subsidies for bread; oil; sugar; milk; kefir; skimmed cheese; margarine; animal fat; groats; macaroni with the exception of the "extra" group; baby food of a milk and cereal basis, including food concentrates; fuel sold to the population; medicines; goods for medical use; technical means for preventive measures against disablement and for rehabilitation of invalids; transportation services and other goods and services of social significance to which state regulated prices and tariffs apply; and to establish the order of allocating subsidies from the budget on these goods and services.

3. The Ukrainian Ministry of Economy, with the participation of the interested ministries and departments, is to establish the fixing of prices and tariffs on produce, goods, and services envisaged in the appendix to this resolution; to fix the statutory prices on timber (?which is sold not felled) and [words indistinct] geological-prospecting works; to fix the size of trade discounts and extra charges on goods to which state retail price regulation apply and (?deposit) prices on glassware; to work out and confirm the form and application of free prices and tariffs on produce, goods, and services; of repricing the remains of goods and the mechanism of regulating prices on the produce of monopolist enterprises taking the anti-monopoly legislation into consideration; to submit, when necessary, proposals to the Ukraine Cabinet of Ministers on changes of the nomenclature of the level of prices and tariffs on produce, goods, and services which are being sold at state regulated prices and tariffs.

4. To give the Ukraine Ministry of Economy the right to introduce state regulation of prices on produce of the monopolist enterprises. To establish when necessary limits of profitability to the cost of produce, works, and services sold at contractual, free prices.

5. With the objective of providing the necessary [word indistinct] conditions for the enterprises of the branch which have a considerable difference in the expenditure for the production and in the investments for the reasons not depending on them: various mining-geological, natural and climatic, and others—to allow the ministries, departments, and other bodies of economic administration with agreement from the Ministry of Economy and the Ministry of Finance of Ukraine to create funds of financial regulation without changes in account with the budget and to establish the rates of deductions to the funds at the expense of profits or to include them in production costs. In the necessary cases, a mechanism of account [rozrakhunkovy] prices can be introduced.

6. The State Construction Commission of the Ukraine, taking into consideration the new price and tariff system, is to provide for formation of the estimate and normative basis and establishment of the order of its application in the construction, to establish control over observing the normatives with customers, project, construction-assembly, and other organizations.

7. The State Inspection of the Ukraine for the Control Over Prices is to work out and confirm with agreement from the Ministry of Economy and the Ministry of Finance of the Ukraine the order of application of economic sanctions for violating prices with a view to anti-monopoly legislation.

8. The Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations together with the Ukraine Ministry of Economy is to submit to the Ukraine Cabinet of Ministers the proposals on changes concerning imported and exported produce with the obligatory conducting of the system of (?protection) of the internal market, that is, by the way of licensing, (?quoting), customs control, and tariff regulation.

9. The Council of Ministers of the Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, the oblast executive committees, and the Kiev and Sevastopol city executive committees are to carry out the regulation of tariffs on municipal and social services except those envisaged in the appendix to this resolution, the tariffs on transporting passengers in urban and suburban transport which work in a special regime, fixed-route taxis, expresses, goods, and passenger routes and others, and extra charges on produce of the enterprises of public catering. The value of previously adopted and partly or fully paid orders for services and the materials for their fulfillment are not subject to reconsideration.

10. The Ukraine Ministry of Statistics together with the Ukraine Ministry of Economy and the interested ministries and departments of the Ukraine are to enter into account that which characterizes the changes in the system of prices and tariffs.

11. The Ukraine Ministry of Economy and the Council of Ministers of the Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, the oblast executive committees, and the Kiev and Sevastopol city executive committees are to make known to the interested ministries, departments, enterprises, organizations, and establishments the instruction materials connected with the introduction of the new price system.

The appendix to the resolution of the Ukraine Cabinet of Ministers carries the limits for raising state prices and tariffs on produce, goods, and services. The limit coefficients for raising prices on the energy resources procured in the Ukraine have been fixed as follows:

on coal—on average 20-fold, here the concrete size of wholesale prices is fixed by associations proceeding from the cost and limit levels of profitability which are established by the State Coal Production Committee of the Ukraine in accordance with changes in the economy of the Ukraine;

on oil and casing-head gas, gas condensate—8-fold;

natural dry gas—6;

[word indistinct] gas—8.5;

thermal energy for industrial use—on average 8-fold;

electric power—on average 9.

The limit coefficients for raising prices on transport services:

transporting cargo on railway transport—5-fold, the same for sea and automobile transport;

river transport—4.5-fold.

For the main (?communication) means the limit coefficient—4.5.

Now, on that which the radio listener shows the most interest: The limit coefficients for raising state prices and tariffs compared to those current in 1991 on consumer goods and services which are sold to the population and certain types of produce of special purpose. Here is the list:

certain types of bread—3;

milk, kefir, and skimmed cheese—3;

margarine—3;

animal fats—3;

pearl barley, oats, semolina, and millet—3;

macaroni with exception of the "extra" group—3;

baby food—3;

sugar—3.5;

oil—3;

vodka and drinking spirits—4;

matches—4;

medicine and produce for medical use—4;

technical means for preventive measures against disablement and for rehabilitation of invalids—4;

gasoline—3;

diesel fuel—2.8;

lighting gas—5;

fuel: coal, peat-coal bricks, firewood for stoves—5;

[word indistinct] gas—5;

gas for network—5;

electric power which is sold for municipal and social needs of the population in countryside settlements—12 kopeks per kilowatt-hour;

in urban settlements except buildings equipped with stationary electric cookers and electric heating installations—15 kopeks per kilowatt-hour;

in urban settlements equipped with stationary electric cookers and electric heating installations—12 kopeks per kilowatt-hour.

Limit coefficients for raising state prices and tariffs compared to those current in 1991 for communal and social services are being fixed as follows:

running water and sewerage—5;

thermal energy for central heating and hot water—3;

rent remains the same.

Limit coefficient for living in hostels—2.5;

coefficients for services of passenger transport, transporting passenger and cargo by railway—3;

suburban—2;

transporting passengers and cargo by sea transport except transporting abroad—2;

transporting passengers and cargo by air—4.

Limit coefficient for river transport for transit transportation—4.5;

for urban and suburban—2.

For transporting passengers and cargo by automobile transport limit coefficients are as follows: in suburban destinations—2 and in inter-urban—on average—5.5. For urban types of transport limit coefficients for raising the current state prices and tariffs are as follows: bus, tram, trolleybus, subway—2; taxis—5. The coefficient for (?communication) services—on average 5.8. The same appendix to the resolution to the Cabinet of Ministers of the Ukraine regulates the limit sizes of profitability in percentage to the cost.

Price Liberalization To Begin 10 Jan

LD0101170892 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Text] In the Ukraine the liberalization of prices will begin on 10 January. From 2 January protective measures are to be introduced. Leonid Kravchuk says that in the Ukraine there is a shortage of money in circulation, and so the Ukraine will go to the market by its own road.

Official on Coupon Circulation Issues

LD0101195792 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 0600 GMT 31 Dec 91

[By correspondent Oksana Malovichko on 30 December meeting of Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] We have already reported that re-usable coupons are being put into circulation from 10 January. A meeting on this subject took place yesterday in the Cabinet of Ministers. Our correspondent Oksana Malovichko was there:

[Malovichko] Understandably the conversation was about the mechanism for introducing the coupons, and efforts were made to take all details into account so that by 10 January the entire population should be provided with re-usable coupons. In brief, they will almost be like money—that is, the new coupons will function as a means of payment. In the shops absolutely everything will be sold for coupons and only for them.

For the time being, it has been decided to issue them for approximately one quarter of wages. Many of you will probably be asking if that is too little; yes, it is a good question, but as I was assured by Oleg Ivanovych Lepichev, Ukrainian deputy prime minister, this figure will change, taking price rises into account. So far nobody knows precisely how prices will increase in January. Forecasts show that prices of some goods will rise by more than 10-fold. The government says that the number of coupons to be issued instead of money will correspondingly change. [passage omitted] [Addressing Lepichev] As you see it, how long will re-usable coupons be used, and what should be the main result of introducing them?

[Lepichev] The main result is the fact that the Ukraine's consumer market will be protected, because nobody else will have the re-usable coupons, only the inhabitants of the Ukraine. The protection of our consumer market is the main aim. After a certain period of time, goods will start to appear on the shelves. I will not say that they will be full, but the goods will begin to appear. This will somehow arrest the rush for goods which exists today for the sake of using up money which has no value.

[Malovichko] I will add that the new coupons are more protected than the existing ruble today. They have a so-called metal (?oxide) which considerably reduces the possibilities for forging them. Of course, control needs to be strengthened over trade and those organizations that will issue coupons, and some measures are envisaged here. Most pleasing is the fact that right now in the Ukraine, there are as many coupons as there are goods, so that today we need only hope that the re-usable coupons will protect us and will help to fill our market with essential goods. And so on 10 January we will be able to say that the first step toward a national monetary system has been taken.

Kravchuk Comments on Minsk Meeting Results

LD3112163591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1515 GMT 31 Dec 91

[By UKRINFORM correspondent Viktor Demidenko]

[Text] Kiev, 31 Dec (TASS)—"The meeting of the heads of independent states in Minsk was not easy. Most of our time and energy was taken up discussing questions of military policy," Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk told a UKRINFORM correspondent on his return to Kiev today.

He noted that from as early as 3 January, the Ukraine will begin the process of creating its own armed forces. This decision was made and signed by the heads of all the states. Moreover, the Ukraine has joined the Commonwealth—and this has been recognized by the heads of all the states—as a non-nuclear, permanently neutral country. It is planned to withdraw tactical nuclear weapons from the territory of the Ukraine before 1 July 1992, strategic nuclear weapons before 1994. Until such time, the Ukraine will exercise rigorous control over the non-use of nuclear weapons, and its president will have special technical control to prevent anyone ever using nuclear weapons from Ukrainian soil. "This is what I am most satisfied with," Leonid Kravchuk stressed.

Regarding economic problems, he noted: The Ukraine is not mechanically accepting what others are doing but is using available experience, taking into account its own specific conditions. In particular, owing to the lack of sufficient cash in the Ukraine, 25 percent of wages are to be paid in re-usable coupons.

The Ukrainian president reported that a decision was adopted, at his proposal, on the fair division of the property abroad of the former USSR. The Ukraine was supported on this issue by all the heads of the independent states. It was also decided to create an interstate commission to elaborate criteria and principles regarding the division of property. In the words of Leonid Kravchuk, "one cannot agree with the fact that only the tricolor flag" of Russia "should be hoisted above the embassies of the former Union."

Minister Notes 'Positive' Talks

LD0101160192 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 0100 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Excerpt] The first working conference of the members of the Commonwealth of Independent States took place on 30 December in Minsk, says Anatoliy Zlenko, Ukraine's foreign minister, who took part in the talks as part of the Ukrainian delegation.

There are grounds to state that the Commonwealth conference ended with positive results, says Anatoliy Zlenko. The most (?ponderable) result was the solution of the issues pertaining to the military field, in particular such a significant issue as strategic armed forces. For Ukraine, this means that from 3d January it will be quite in the right to form its own army, said Anatoliy Zlenko.

One of the strategic problems which cannot be overlooked is the introduction of full market prices. This issue, too, was discussed in Minsk. Naturally, this issue was discussed, but it was not registered in any of the documents, continues Anatoliy Zlenko. Of course, anxiety was expressed that the liberalization of prices can lead to negative consequences, but, at the same time, it could be (?said) during the discussion that everybody is striving to find the most optimum variant for the solution of this problem. I believe that everything is being done so that the state, members of the Commonwealth, reach understanding and corresponding solidarity in the solution of the most complicated problems. The Commonwealth is not the former Union; this is a voluntary amalgamation of independent sovereign states. This is an entirely new amalgamation which completely respects independence and sovereignty of each subject, said Anatoliy Zlenko. [passage omitted]

Kiev Reduces Alert Status on Nuclear Weapons

LD0101234192 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2200 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Text] According to Ukrainian news reports, the Ukraine has started taking nuclear missiles off alert status. Previously, Ukrainian President Kravchuk stated that his republic would not object to the president of Russia becoming the supreme commander in chief of strategic forces, provided some technical operations are carried out to prevent missiles from being launched from Ukrainian territory.

The agreement on the united control of the nuclear arsenal was reached at the meetings of leaders of the Commonwealth of Independent States. But the question of conventional armed forces is more complex. The Minsk meeting failed to reach a unanimous view on the subject. The Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Moldova want to create their own armies, leaving to the united command only control over nuclear weapons. The other eight republics would like to preserve the united armed forces.

Spokesman on Armed Forces Subordination

LD0201120992 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1056 GMT 2 Jan 92

[By UKRINFORM correspondent N. Zayka]

[Text] Kiev, 2 Jan (TASS)—From tomorrow all troops stationed in the Ukraine, with the exception of strategic nuclear forces, are being transferred to the direct subordination of the Ukrainian president and the Ukrainian Defense Ministry. Starting from this date, they will be taking an oath of allegiance to the Ukrainian people, Major A. Kluban, the chief of the press service at the Ukrainian Defense Ministry, told UKRINFORM.

A list of the units that are part of the strategic forces will be defined by a working group, which will begin its work in Kiev on 3 January. This list will be a minimal one, and, as the nuclear weapons on Ukrainian territory are reduced, it will be shortened proportionately—up to its entire elimination. The Ukrainian Defense Ministry does not regard the forces of the Black Sea Fleet as part of the strategic nuclear forces. That's why reactions to their subordination and reform are similar to those of the troops of the military districts, Major A. Kluban noted. The servicemen who will not wish to take an oath of allegiance to the Ukrainian people will be able to leave for other states of the CIS to continue their service or be transferred to the reserve.

USSR Minister on Armed Forces Formation

PM0201094592 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Dec 91 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Colonel General B. Pyankov, USSR deputy defense minister, by Colonel A. Polyakov in Kiev; date of interview not given: "General B. Pyankov: Rumors of a 1.5- Million- Strong Army in the Ukraine Are a Considerable Exaggeration"]

[Text] As has already been reported, a group of USSR Ministry of Defense officers and generals is in the Ukraine at present giving assistance to the sovereign state in the formation of its own armed forces. Our permanent correspondent in Kiev, Colonel A. Polyakov, met with Colonel General B. Pyankov, USSR deputy defense minister, who heads this group.

[Polyakov] Boris Yevgenyevich, first of all I would like to know what your group represents and what tasks it is tackling.

[Pyankov] It is made up of professional servicemen and representatives of all categories of troops and USSR Ministry of Defense main and central directorates. We took a kind of "inventory" of the group of troops deployed in the Ukraine and prepared a final document and submitted it to the Ukrainian leadership. We made proposals on the troops and the units serving them that should be categorized as Strategic Deterrent Forces and the ones it would be expedient to use as a basis for the formation of Ukrainian armed forces.

[Polyakov] So have you taken all the military in the Ukraine into consideration? What picture emerges? Certain mass media, for example, are circulating reports to the effect that an army of almost 1.5 million men is concentrated on the banks of the Dnepr....

[Pyankov] That is not true. There are just over 500,000 servicemen concentrated in the Ukraine. That includes everyone in uniform, including the Strategic Deterrent Forces units. These units make up approximately half of the force and will be subordinate to unified command.

[Polyakov] I heard in the lobbies of the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense that your group is attempting to categorize even military construction workers as Strategic Deterrent Forces....

[Pyankov] There is nothing surprising in that. There are around 70 USSR Ministry of Defense military construction detachments in the Ukraine. Almost half of them are working in the interests of the Strategic Missile Forces, naval forces, and aviation. If some of them are not made subordinate to the Strategic Deterrent Forces, then who will build houses, install communications, and equip command posts for these forces? You can see for yourself that we are playing fair. You have to understand that the Strategic Deterrent Forces are not simply launchers and missiles. This is a powerful heterogeneous organism whose vital activity must be ensured properly.

[Polyakov] Boris Yevgenyevich, you have stressed repeatedly that you are helping to form a friendly army. Have your views always coincided with those of the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense leadership's views?

[Pyankov] There are no serious differences of opinion between us. But work is work, and there are always those little points of difference. Some of the generals and officers from the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense would like to speed up the process of transferring the troops to the new command. But surely the point is not which cabinet will draft the troops tomorrow. No, that is certainly not the case. It is more important to ensure reliable command and control of the troops and set up sound backup for them. You must understand that such questions are not resolved in one day. Suppose we hand everything over from one set of hands to another. Of course that would be simpler, but would the Ukrainian armed forces gain anything from it? Haste will not prove useful in the formation of the Ukrainian armed forces main staff either. Furthermore, certain representatives of the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense want the command and control of the troops to be done without any interim structures—that is, they suppose that they can do without military districts. I think that is wrong. This kind of command cannot be effective if you bear in mind the fairly large force, the vastness of the Ukraine's territory, and the large mobilization resources.

[Polyakov] When exactly might some of the units and resources be transferred to Ukrainian Ministry of Defense authority?

[Pyankov] I believe that this has to be preceded by a joint military-political decision and the adoption of documents regulating military building in independent states. Independent activity and improvisation with the armed forces is likely to result in unforeseeable consequences.

[Polyakov] Evidently the formation of the Ukrainian armed forces will entail a great deal of material expenditure.

[Pyankov] Undoubtedly. And believe me, I am not trying to intimidate anyone with the prospect of having to spend many millions. That is simply how it is going to be. I am not going to list the whole volume of work; it is enormous. We are encouraged by the fact that Ukrainian President L. Kravchuk is well aware of this and gives in-depth consideration to questions of military building.

President Appoints New Deputy Prime Minister

LD2812000291 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 0600 GMT 27 Dec 91

[Text] Ukrainian President Kravchuk appointed Oleg Ivanovich Lepichev by decree as a Ukrainian deputy prime minister.

Oleg Ivanovich Lepichev was born on 14 August 1949 to a poor Ukrainian family in Lugansk. He graduated from the Donetsk Soviet Trade Institute in 1976. Lepichev began his working career in 1967 after graduating from the Lugansk Technical School of Soviet Trade. He has held various posts in the state trade system of Lugansk Oblast. Since August 1987, he worked as the first deputy trade minister. In December 1989, he was appointed minister of Ukrainian trade. He is married, and his wife is a teacher. He has a son who was born in 1971 and is now a law student at Kiev State University.

Azerbaijan

Presidential Rule Introduced in 'Some Areas'

LD0201162892 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 2 Jan 92

[By AZERINFORM-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Baku January 2 TASS—Presidential rule has been introduced in some areas of Azerbaijan today by a decree issued by the republic's president Ayaz Mutalibov.

Presidential rule has been introduced temporarily on the territory covering the city of Khankendi (formerly Stepanakert), Shusha and a number of other districts of Azerbaijan. The administration of the territory has been entrusted to an authorised official appointed by the republic's president.

This move has been undertaken, the decree points out, "in view of the complication of the situation in the region, in order to ensure the coordination of activities to strenghen the safety of the population and to restore the constitutional order, and in accordance with Azerbaijan's law 'on additional measures to stabilise the economic and socio-political life of the republic'".

President Mutalibov on Minsk CIS Meeting

LD0201132692 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1200 GMT 2 Jan 92

[Text] The heads of sovereign states continue to comment on the Minsk meeting. Mutalibov, the president of Azerbaijan, stated that this meeting confirmed the necessity and possibility of creating a new form of cooperation within the framework of the political space of the former Union. This is clearly seen from the example of discussing the fate of the Armed Forces of the former USSR. Finally, the Commonwealth is being formed not under conditions of dictatorship and imposing someone's will, but is taken as the natural necessity of a complex transitional period, the president of Azerbaijan said.

NKAO Seeks UN Recognition, Troops

OW0201124492 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 2 Jan 92

[Transmitted by KYODO]

[Text] The Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Council of People's Deputies in Nagorno-Karabakh [Autonomous Oblast—NKAO] Leonard Petrosyan requested Wednesday [1 January] the United Nations' Secretary General Butrus Ghali to promote official recognition of the republic proclaimed by the Armenian community in Nagorno-Karabakh and send troops to that area to avert the incipient genocide of the Armenian community.

Hostilities are, meanwhile, reported from Nagorno-Karabakh. On the night from Dec 31 to Jan 1 Azerbaijani militants attacked the settlements of Khramort and Farukh in the Askeran district but Armenian forces beat them off.

Hostilities started on New Year's Eve and have continued into today, Jan 1, along the whole length of the Gheranboy, or Shaumian, district with Azerbaijan. Azerbaijani units have spearheaded the main attack against the settlements of Karachinar and Buzluk.

Karabakh's capital Stepanakert, called Khankendi by Azerbaijanis, has come under repeated artillery raids. Armenian forces are reported to have regained control of previously lost positions, including a mound with a commanding view near the capital's suburb Kirkidjan.

Casualties have been reported on both sides.

Stepanakert Shelled; Settlement Attacked

LD0101172792 Moscow TASS in English 1716 GMT 1 Jan 92

[By correspondent Roman Zadunayskiy]

[Text] Moscow January 1 TASS—Stepanakert (Khankendi) was under intensive artillery and Alazan rocket fire on the New Year's eve, deputy chairman of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republican Executive Committee, Suren Grigoryan, told TASS over the telephone.

The shelling began at 23:00 local time. The fire grew even more intensive when city residents saw the New Year in. Wounded and dozens of devastated houses were reported.

About 200 Azerbaijani members of OMON (special police unit) and three APCs attacked an Armenian settlement in the Askeransky region of Nagorno-Karabakh in the afternoon of January 1, 1992, Grigoryan said. Dozens of houses were destroyed, wounded have been reported.

Georgia

Economic Situation Termed 'Catastrophic'

LD0201143192 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1200 GMT 2 Jan 92

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Georgia's economic situation is now catastrophic: shortages of fuel, electricity, and raw materials are causing production stoppages and massive unemployment. Georgia has enough grain, for instance, for only the first 40 days of the new year. Halting of deliveries from other republics is the equivalent of economic death to Georgia. The inhabitants of Tbilisi are victims of looting and bandits. Nevertheless Kitovani's rebel guards lack neither money nor arms. Some observers believe that they are being financed generously by the republic's business circles.

Reportage Updates Increased Tbilisi Violence

Deputy Defense Minister Said Executed

*LD3112160691 Hamburg DPA in German
1516 GMT 31 Dec 91*

[Text] Moscow (DPA)—Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia has had his deputy defense minister and a deputy of his governing coalition shot, according to a report from the news agency INTERFAX.

As INTERFAX reported on 31 December, citing the opposition National Democratic Party from the Georgian capital, Tbilisi, Deputy Defense Minister Nodar Georgadze and Deputy Dschemal Koletiani were executed in the president's bunker in the government building during the night or the early hours of 31 December. Official sources would not confirm this to INTERFAX.

According to the report, Georgadze was involved in the negotiations on the government side with the opposition on 29 December. Following the collapse of the talks, he had called upon the president to attend the negotiations personally or to resign.

Execution 'Not Confirmed'

*LD0201053492 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 0300 GMT 2 Jan 92*

[Text] Fierce shooting resumed in central Tbilisi yesterday.

Foreign radio stations' reports on the execution of Nodar Georgadze, Georgian deputy defense minister, in the bunker of Government House on 31 December have not been confirmed so far.

Foreign Minister Said Arrested

*LD3112192791 Moscow TASS in English
1849 GMT 31 Dec 91*

[Text] Tbilisi, 31 December TASS—Leader of the Georgian Democratic Party Georgiy Chanturia, released only several days ago, has warned that the dictatorship of Gamsakhurdia has fallen down politically "but the agony may last long and grow into a war".

Commenting on Gamsakhurdia's statement that he is ready to begin peace talks if the opposition drops its demand for his resignation, Chanturia said "the statement only goes to prove that the only thing that Gamsakhurdia worried about (?was his) post. To retain it, he is ready to plague the country into chaos and sacrifice hundreds of lives".

The radio said from 2,000 to 4,000 armed people are defending the Government House in Tbilisi. Several republican ministers, as well Deputies Georgian Defence Minister Kutateladze and Georgadze [as received], have agreed that Gamsakhurdia should resign to (?end) the bloodshed in the republic.

Georgadze, who is also the leader of the Union of Afghan War Veterans, was captured soon after he made this statement and brought to the Government House.

Analysts fear this action may (?force) union members to join the opposition.

According to unverified reports, Georgian Foreign Minister Murman Omanidze, until recently the closest associate of Gamsakhurdia, is also being held under arrest.

'Amateur Radio' Criticizes Opposition

*LD0101121892 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1130 GMT 1 Jan 92*

[Text] Moscow, 1 Jan (TASS)—"In Georgian Government House the New Year celebrations are taking place in a condition of martial law. Members of the Georgian Supreme Soviet are not experiencing food shortages and feel well." This report has come via a radio operator of the Red Cross rescue service located in Government House.

This report, transmitted to TASS by amateur radio channels, says that in Tbilisi a tram carrying passengers on its normal route was blown up. Two persons were killed and eight were injured. The act is being blamed on the opposition. The same sources report that the Presidium of Georgian Supreme Soviet has taken the decision to suspend the powers of 46 deputies who "took part in the coup and are guilty of mass pogroms and murders in Tbilisi".

"The opposition managed to go on the air but the only result was the showing of old films and the transmission of slanderous information against the government and the president of the republic," the radioed report from Government House asserts. According to these same reports the television center has had its electricity cut off, and the opposition has been deprived of the possibility of continuing its transmissions. But information has been received from the Georgian Supreme Soviet that in Government House a radio station has started operating on two frequencies of the medium wave band.

According to reports by the Georgian Ministry of Internal Affairs, on the 31 December 17 corpses were delivered to the morgue, the same radio amateur report says.

Opposition Discusses Forming Coalition

*LD0101194192 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1300 GMT 1 Jan 92*

[Text] Armed opposition and other political parties and movements in Georgia held preliminary consultations today on setting up a coalition of democratic forces. One of the leaders of the armed opposition, Dzhaba Ioseliani, told journalists that the consultations made it clear that there is unity in attitude toward the latest events in Tbilisi. Because we have exhausted all means and have not been able to hold a dialogue with the president of Georgia, Ioseliani said, we intend to form a temporary national committee that will take over the responsibility of making all further political decisions in order to topple the Gamsakhurdia dictatorship.

According to Ioseliani, the creation of such a committee is necessary because the Georgian Cabinet of Ministers has practically removed itself from governing the republic. He added that the armed opposition will abide by the decisions of this committee. Georgiy Chanturia, leader of the National Democratic Party of Georgia, told the RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY that his party will not take part in the coalition committee.

At noon today there was heavy fighting again in the center of Tbilisi. By 1500 the government house was being shelled with anti-aircraft guns. This was a report from the RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY.

Airport Runway Mined

LD0101170592 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1556 GMT 1 Jan 92

[By correspondent Viktor Voronyuk]

[Text] Tbilisi, 1 Jan (TASS)—Tbilisi Airport passengers got an unexpected "present": On the eve of the new year, a radio-controlled demolition charge and three anti-tank mines set up in a row were found on the landing strip.

According to the deputy head of the airport, who refused to give his name, this is due first of all to the unpredictability of the situation in Tbilisi. He claimed the armed opposition is willing to take extreme measures, even to blow up the landing strip.

Today, most of the passengers who have been sleeping at the airport since 23 December while waiting for flights managed to meet with the administration of Tbilisi Airport. But neither the talks nor a rally held next to the immobilized aircraft produced any results. Several passengers volunteered to clear the landing strip of mines but were unsuccessful in their attempt.

The situation at the airport is complicated. Air passengers believe the administration is at fault and that, according to them, it cheats them, trying to extract additional charges from them by every possible means.

Government House Storming 'Inevitable'

LD0101182892 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Jan 92

[Text] The storming of Government House is inevitable and will take place in the near future. We repeatedly have proposed a truce and held talks with Gamsakhurdia's representatives, but nothing has come of it, Tengiz Kitovani, one of the leaders of the armed opposition, told RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY [RIA] journalists. A president who sits in his bunker and does not govern the country is no longer a president, Kitovani said. According to him, Gamsakhurdia now has 1,200-1,500 men. Now, he noted, most of his former supporters in the government have left Gamsakhurdia, and 70 to 80 percent are staying neutral.

We will surround Government House and force Gamsakhurdia to leave it, Kitovani went on to say.

Asked by an RIA correspondent why the guards had not stormed Government House back during the September events in Tbilisi, Kitovani noted that public opinion in general had not been ready for it at that time. Gamsakhurdia was still regarded as the elected leader and was supported by the entire Georgian people. Now world opinion regards him as a Caucasian Husayn, Kitovani said.

Conflict 'Spreading Out'

LD0101180392 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1740 GMT 1 Jan 92

[By correspondent Viktor Voronyuk]

[Text] Tbilisi, 1 Jan (TASS)—The New Year has not brought any relief to the people of Tbilisi. The military action zone is spreading out—by this evening its borders encompassed the territory from Freedom Square (formerly Lenin Square) to the Tbilisi Philharmonic Building. As a result of shooting and fires, the buildings of the Pioneer and Officer Houses, the opera theater, and many shops and residential buildings on Rustaveli Prospekt have sustained considerabe damage.

The Freedom Square metro station has not been open for more than a week, and, according to metro officials, Rustaveli station also may close soon. Shots also can be heard on the city outskirts, although it has been claimed that this is a gun salute to mark the New Year.

The most alarming thing is the death toll. According to unofficial figures, the number of dead as a result of the continuing armed conflict is approaching 300.

Russia Urged To Support President

LD0101231792 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2237 GMT 1 Jan 92

[By correspondent Sergey Voytishkin]

[Text] London, 2 Jan (TASS)—An official representative of Zviad Gamsakhurdia has called on the Russian Government to give support to the besieged Georgian president. He warns that Russia's southern borders will otherwise witness an outbreak of "a fire like the one that has still not been extinguished in Afghanistan." "The Russian authorities must immediately tell all Russians in the Transcaucasian republics that the interests of the new democratic Russia demand that President Gamsakhurdia continue to govern Georgia in accordance with the will of the Georgian people," says a statement published in London by the official representative of the Georgian president.

'Fiercer' Fighting Noted

LD0201122192 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1100 GMT 2 Jan 92

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The shootings on the streets of Tbilisi on the first day of the New Year became fiercer, and there has been shooting not only on Rustaveli Prospekt but also in other parts of the city, for instance next to Gosteleradio, the State Department, and the train station.

Of the other news, one must note the persistant rumors of the execution by firing squad in the Government House of Deputy Defense Minister Georgadze, the chairman of the Union of Afghan Veterans, and Supreme Soviet Deputy Goletiani who are there under arrest. True, so far it does not seem to be possible to verify the authenticity of this information.

Another report has come via channels of the Russian Amateur Radio Accident Service, from the Presidium of the Georgian Supreme Soviet: The opposition fired on a vehicle carrying food supplies for the Government House. The opposition is trying to blockade the Government House. At 0800 this morning a yellow helicopter flew out in the direction of the Government House and made an attempt to drop a cistern on the building but the cistern fell between the buildings of Secondary School No. 1 and the Ministry of Communications. No explosion followed.

Starting at 0430, for one hour the opposition fired at the Government House using howitzers, mortars, and automatic weapons. The intense firing went on for one hour. The Government House defenders did not return fire.

On Station Square yesterday there was a big rally in support of the legally elected president and government of the republic. Representives of the armed bands who have for 10 days now been besieging the Government House came on the scene and opened fire. The people first started running away but soon came back and turned on the attackers who were forced to retire quickly.

Opposition Leaders Meet Moscow Press

PM0201120092 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Dec 91 Union Edition p 3

[G. Ivanov-Smolenskiy report: "Georgia: Anatomy of Fratricide"]

[Text] The Moscow Press Club held a meeting with representatives of the Georgian opposition (political and unarmed) at the Central House of the Journalist on Tuesday [24 December]. After the meeting, the journalists were shown a documentary movie on the prehistory and background to today's tragic events, followed by a record of the fighting, just brought in from Tbilisi under fire.

The old school next to Government House is enveloped in smoke. On my visits to Tbilisi I have passed it hundreds of times. They say it is completely burned out. I have walked hundreds, maybe thousands of times along Rustaveli Prospekt—I have never come across a more carefree and colorful street. The news pictures show young guys who only a year ago would promenade up and down this street without a care, now running along it carrying a wounded man—a torn and bloody shirt, arms hanging lifeless....

All the participants in the meeting—including Valerian Advadze, former Georgian presidential candidate; Valeriy Kvaratskheliya, political commentator (also former, as he bitterly observed) on Georgian television; Irakliy Kadagishvili, one of the leaders of the National Democratic Party; and Georgiy Chkoniya, the "free artist"—all of them said sadly that it is a tragedy for Georgia. But a tragedy brought on the Georgian people by the policy of the president they themselves elected.

"Gamsakhurdia has been turning Georgia into another Albania. The armed uprising is taking place because of the hopeless position the Georgian people find themselves in... A democratic revolution is taking place in Tbilisi, by extreme and tragic methods, it is true, but this is not a struggle for power, it is a struggle for democracy....

"Until very recently nobody was telling Gamsakhurdia that he should leave the political stage. They were telling him he must act. But he continued to rant and rave about 'Kremlin agents' and 'enemies of the Georgian people,' even when the empire had already in effect ceased to exist. He brought his people's life—public life and daily life—to the brink. If we wait four years for an opportunity to replace Gamsakhurdia by democratic means, it will be disastrous for Georgia. He is a man who seeks enemies pathologically, who cannot live without someone to fight. The struggle, the splitting of Georgian society will continue until he goes. He knows it. But he will not go."

Those, to sum up, were the arguments of the speakers at the meeting, their view of the Georgian drama. You may agree or disagree, wholly or in part. Be that as it may, there are, in my view, two important considerations to be drawn from the tragic stories of the Georgian oppositionists, and in particular from the film by two young products of the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography, Anna Novikova and Igor Borisenko.

A key place in the more or less political debates was held by the assertion that the rights of the individual certainly rank higher than the rights of the nation. But in our case what happens again and again is the reverse of this. Amid the "smoke of the fatherland"—the Armenian-Azerbaijani, Ossetian-Georgian, or other bloody conflicts—the "isolated individual" and his sovereign right to life are completely forgotten. The Tbilisi drama has revealed, with full dramatic force, that the basic human right—the right to life—is bound to be flouted where the rights and "interests" of the nation are placed far and away higher than individual rights.

And another thing. When I see lifeless bodies being dragged along the flagstones of Rustaveli Prospekt and Georgians firing their Kalashnikovs at Georgians, I find myself thinking this. In all our disputes about the army and the share-out of its property, we cite all kinds of arguments, but not, in my view, the most important one. Sovereignties, shares of the military budget... In fact the argument in favor of not handing over heavy arms to a number of republics is logical, simple, and humanitarian: You do not supply—nor, therefore, do you leave—weapons to unstable regimes. That is the practice in the entire civilized world, as we are so fond of saying. The fratricide in Georgia confirms the correctness of this approach.

Clashes Continue in South Ossetia

LD0101141392 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 1 Jan 92

[By correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz January 1 TASS—Seven people were wounded on the New Year night in heavy shootouts in Tskhinvali, according to unconfirmed reports from the administrative centre of South Ossetia. Two houses were set ablaze and an electric power transforming station destroyed.

Clashes between Georgian and Ossetian militants lasted for three hours in the Dmenisi settlement. Both sides reportedly suffered losses.

17 houses were burned down and 22 hostages taken last night in remote settlements of the Tskhinvali and Znaur regions, populated mostly by Ossetians, eye witnesses said. The attackers took away cattle and food.

The Ossetian military failed to bring food to Tskhinvali, as trucks could not get through the blockade. They got under machinegun fire near the settlement of Kekhvi and were forced to retreat.

Only cross country vehicles can reach Tskhinvali along a road going through the mountains, but drivers are taking big risks as the road is covered with ice.

Kyrgyzstan

Government To Free Prices With Russia

LD3112185291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1600 GMT 31 Dec 91

["Television News Service" interview with Kyrgyzstan Supreme Soviet Chairman M. Sherimkulov by unidentified correspondent, place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Will Kyrgyzstan carry out price liberalization in parallel with Russia?

[Sherimkulov] We will do that with a heavy heart. We cannot, for example, raise pay by 90 percent like the Russians, let's suppose. We have calculated our possibilities and our budget and determined that we cannot raise it by more than 40 percent.

New 'Asaba' Party Registered 30 Dec

OW3012175791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1516 GMT 30 Dec 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Kyrgyz Justice Ministry formally registered the new Party of National Revival "Asaba" ("Banner") Monday [30 December].

Chairman of the Party Asan Ormushev told IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent that "Asaba's" main goals are the construction of a democratic Kazakhstan, the revival of the national culture and the protection of the economic and political interests of Kyrgyzstan.

Supporting in general the reform policy of Kyrgyzstan's President Askar Akayev, the "Asaba" Party opposes the republican government and parliament which, in its opinion, are composed of the old party "nomenklatura" representatives.

Mr. Ormushev said "Asaba" considers its top priority the land reform and privatization of trade and industrial spheres. At least 50 of private owners should be of the Kyrgyz nationality, it suggests.

Though the party is determined to protect the interests exclusively of the Kyrgyz people, "we also respect the rights of ethnic minorities living on Kyrgyz territory."

Tajikistan

Republic 'Toying' With Plans To Sell Uranium

LD0201110592 Hamburg DPA in German 0941 GMT 2 Jan 92

[Text] Dushanbe (DPA)—Tajikistan, the southernmost republic of the former Soviet Union in central Asia, is threatening to become a factor of nuclear instability worldwide. According to reports in Tajik parliamentary circles today, the leadership is toying with the idea of selling abroad enriched uranium and technology for processing uranium. Interested parties from Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Turkey, and Pakistan have already been to the republic's capital, Dushanbe. President Rakhman Nabiyev intends to travel to India for talks soon.

Tajikistan, which is in the northern Himalayas, has rich uranium deposits at its disposal. The first uranium enrichment enterprise was built in 1940 in Leninabad in the north of the republic at the personal instruction of Soviet dictator Stalin. The fissile material for the first Soviet atomic bomb was produced in Tajikistan.

The Tajik leadership's plans apparently go even further. Cooperation in extending uranium mining and uranium enrichment with the rich Arab countries and with Iran have been considered. Recently new uranium deposits were discovered in Tajikistan and these are to be mined.

Turkmenia

President Issues Decrees on Banks, Wages

LD0101175392 Ashkhabad Radio Ashkabad Network in Russian 1600 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Text] In order to implement effective measures to insure the stabilization of money and credit policy in the conditions of price liberalization, Turkmenistan President Saparmurad Niyazov has issued a decree on providing finance and credit guarantees for the economic reform and on restructuring the banking system. With this decree the Turkmenistan Republican Bank of the USSR State Bank is abolished and the Turkmenistan State Bank is created. The Turkmenistan State Bank is given the status of the only organ in the territory of Turkmenistan that can create state monetary credit and foreign currency policy.

In order to improve the social security of various sections of the population following the liberalization of prices, President Niyazov has issued a decree stipulating that the minimum wage is set at 350 rubles [R] a month, depending on age. The rate set by the law on pension security of the Turkmenistan Soviet Socialist Republic dated 25 March 1991 is to be increased by 2.9 times. A special decision was adopted on this question by the president.

In order to secure the labor and social security of workers in the conditions of liberalization of prices and development of the free market, President Saparmurad Niyazov has adopted a decree on increasing the minimum wages and abolishing limits on the increase of wages and the means [words indistinct] to be used. According to the decree, with effect from 1 January 1992 the minimum wage must be set at R350 a month, backdated to April 1991. From 1 January 1992, regular working time must be 40 hours per week. From 1 January 1992, the practice of setting limits on wages must be abolished.

In order to narrow the gap between wages in production and non-production branches of the national economy, provide state support, and improve the state social security of workers in health, education, culture, science departments and organizations, law enforcement bodies, administrative bodies and other organizations financed by the budget, President Saparmurad Niyazov has adopted a decree stating that the wages of workers in these organizations and departments will increase by an average of 2.9 times from 1 January 1992.

These decrees and decisions are being published in the press.

Uzbekistan

Karimov on Conventional Forces Subordination

LD3112173891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1600 GMT 31 Dec 91

["Television News Service" report on remarks by Uzbekistan President Islam Karimov on returning to Tashkent from Minsk conference—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] We have already received the first interviews with leaders of the independent states who have returned to their capitals from Minsk.

[Karimov] As far as conventional weapons are concerned, I maintained, and will maintain, that the armed forces on the territory of the republics must have a character of dual subordination so that the republics may influence the conduct of military policy of a defensive nature. I am convinced that there are scores of questions that demand an immediate solution. But as always happens, we prepare very badly just before a meeting.

Supreme Soviet To Convene 4 Jan

LD0201120892 Tashkent Radio Tashkent Network in Uzbek 0300 1 Jan 91

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the republic of Uzbekistan has decreed that the Ninth Extraordinary Session of the 12th Convocation of the Uzbekistan Supreme Soviet convene on 4 January 1992 in Tashkent. The following questions will be on the agenda for examination:

1. (?Report) by the Central Election Commission on the presidential election in Uzbekistan and results of the referendum on the state independence of the republic of Uzbekstan;

2. The Commonwealth countries and ratification [words indistinct];

3. Ratification of an agreement on relations between Uzbekistan and Turkey and confirmation of (?cooperation) between Uzbekistan and Turkey in the economic and trade spheres;

4. Recognition of the state independence of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and the Ukraine. [passage indistinct]

Other questions will also be discussed.

Opposition To Continue Fight for Democracy

OW3112171391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1545 GMT 31 Dec 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] December 29, 1991, when the republic went to the polls to elect its president "is the beginning, not the end of the struggle," said Dilorom Iskhakova, one of the leaders of the Uzbek opposition party Erk.

"We will do what we have been doing up to now, i.e., work for the democratisation of the republic which continues to be affected by totalitarianism," emphasized Iskhakova in an interview with IF [INTERFAX].

Preliminary reports say that the election was carried by the current Uzbek president Islam Karimov who ran against Erk's chairman Muhammad Solikh [name as received].

The Erk Central Council reports that on Monday [30 December] young people staged a demonstration in the city of Namangan in support of Solikh, demanding an independent expert commission to go into the results of the election.

IF has thus far failed to confirm this report from other sources.

Bush Sends Message to Uzbekistan President

OW3112003391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2047 GMT 30 Dec 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] U.S. President George Bush has sent President Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan a personal message expressing the American government's recognition of the independence of that Central Asian republic. Mr. Bush hopes that Uzbekistan will take steps to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

According to the U.S. president, his country attaches considerable significance to Uzbekistan's commitment to market relations and its responsible approach to military-political matters.

Last Sunday [29 December] saw the holding in Uzbekistan of a republic-wide referendum on independence and of presidential elections in which, according to fresh reports, Mr. Karimov won a landslide victory, collecting 86 of the total number of votes. His rival Mohamed Salikh, a poet and leader of the Democratic Party Erk, emerged with 12.4% of the votes.

The Sunday referendum attracted nearly 10 million of the 10.5% million people eligible to vote, of whom 98.2% cast their ballots in favor of full republican independence.

North Korea Ready To Establish Relations

LD0201105792 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 2 Jan 91

[Text] Tashkent January 2 (TASS)—The Government of North Korea has welcomed the formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

"The Democratic People's Republic of Korea recognises the independence of Uzbekistan and expresses its readiness to establish diplomatic relations with it," said Minister of Foreign Relations of North Korea Kim Yong-nam in a telegram addressed to the leadership of Uzbekistan. Uzbekistan has already been recognised by Argentina, Egypt, China, the United States, Turkey, Switzerland, Japan and a number of other countries in 1991.